THE LIBRARIES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

GENERAL LIBRARY



Engraved by P. Reason.

GRANVILLE SHARP, ESQ^R.

PHILANTHROPIST.

A

MEMOIR

OF

GRANVILLE SHARP,

TO WHICH IS ADDED SHARP'S "LAW OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE," AND AN EXTRACT FROM HIS "LAW OF RETRIBUTION."

BY CHARLES STUART.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

No. 144 Nassau Street.

WILLIAM S. DORR, PRINTER.

1836.

92Sh20
S

CONTENTS.

SECTION I. PAGE

G. Sharp's birth &c.—Slavery in England—Jonathan Strong—Sharp's Prosecution and Challenge—Triumph—Thomas Lewis—Sharp's Principles..... 5

SECTION II.

James Somerset—Mr. Davy's Argument—Sharp's Letter to Lord North—Extract from Journal—Mr. Mansfield's Argument—Mr. Hargrave's—Mr. Alleyne's—Mr. Wallace's—Mr. Dunning's—Lord Mansfield's Judgment—Observations..... 10

SECTION III.

Sharp finds Coadjutors in Benezet, Franklin, and Rush—Investigates the Revolutionary contest and condemns the Government—Resigns his Office under Government—Omai—Gen. Oglethorpe—Settlement of Georgia—Sharp's sentiments on "*Necessity*" and Justice—Extract from a Letter to Archbishop of York—Las Casas Bishop of Chiapa—Case of the Zong—Dr. Hinchcliff, Bishop of Peterborough—Harry Demane—Correspondence with Franklin and Jay—Colleges of R. Island, Massachusetts, and Virginia—Emancipated Slaves in distress in England—Mr. Smeatham—Sierra Leone—Settlement and description of Sierra Leone—Observations upon Tropical climates—Progress of the Settlement—Settlement transferred by Sharp to a Commercial Company—War—Nova Scotia Settlers—Dreadful sickness and mortality—French attack—Deserter's town refugees—Observations on civilized arrogance—Maroons—Government assumed by King—Naimbana—Reflections on Naimbana's foresight..... 20

146137

SECTION IV.

African Slave trade attacked—Slave produce—Prosecution of the attack—Legal Abolition of African Slave trade—Sharp's characteristic views—Wm. Pitt and Thos. Clarkson—Sharp's exculpation of himself—Bible Society—African Institution—African feelings towards White men prior to Sierra Leone—Object of African Institution—General features of Sharp—Sir Wm. Jones—Approaching death—"Departure"—General Observations..... 53

SECTION V.

The Colonization favored by Granville Sharp compared with that of the American Colonization Society..... 66

APPENDIX.

1. Quotations of various Legal Authorities..... 85
2. The Trelawney Refugees..... 89
3. Observations upon Sierra Leone; and questions for exercise at leiure hours..... 90

LAW OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE..... 95

EXTRACT FROM LAW OF RETRIBUTION..... 135

MEMOIR.

SECTION I.

GRANVILLE SHARP was born at Durham in England, on 10th November, 1735. His earlier education was limited. In 1750, he was apprenticed, in London, to *a Friend*—afterwards to an Independent—and subsequently to a Romanist. This intercourse with different persuasions, appears to have had no effect upon his own creed—but he learnt from it, one of the most glorious lessons which man can learn, the cordial practice of that gracious *charity*, which "vaunteth not itself"—"which suffereth long and is kind."

Collision with a Socinian, who boasted that the original language of the New Testament favored his views, led Sharp to study the Greek—and controversy with a Jew, impelled him to the acquisition of the Hebrew. "To be ignorant of the truth, was to him a source of inexpressible pain; and to neglect the means of acquiring it, intolerable disgrace."

In 1757–8, he lost his parents—and from that time, he served the Government, in the Ordnance Department, until the beginning of the American war, in 1776, his prospects in life depending upon his situation. But duty, not interest, was his law; and when he found, that if he retained his office, he must be accessory to bloodshed, he did not hesitate to resign. In this, as throughout life, he evinced, that *eternal truth*, according to the scriptures, was his chief study—and "glory to God in the highest—and on earth, peace, good will to men" his great end. The pursuits of

his subsequent life were various; but an ardent love of holy and impartial liberty, always eminently distinguished him, and to the sufferers of wrong, he was invariably an active and disinterested friend.

At this time slavery had disgraced the British Colonies in America and in the West Indies, for two hundred years. The righteous laws of the empire, had been evaded or perverted; and *opinion* and *precedent* had been substituted for *law*. Rulers and people had bowed down to the abomination. The Church and the world had given it, their sanction. The most distinguished lawyers crouched beneath the lie, and the Lord Chief Justice of the day, affirmed its validity. Truth and love, religion and humanity, were trampled upon without remorse. The inalienable rights of man, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" were given to the winds; and Britain, boasting of her love for liberty, was a *slave-mistress;* a slave-dealer; and a carrier of slaves.

In the course of this hypocritical and ferocious system, the slave masters of the west, had long been in the habit of bringing over domestic slaves, to serve them, presuming that they could transfer their *pirate-rights* to England. But their poor slaves judged better. Every where, they heard the voice—every where, they saw the step of liberty—and they panted to be free. The voice of nature and of nature's God, *in* them, and in all *around* them, told them that they had as good a title to liberty as their masters had—and many a British heart, untainted by the prevailing wickedness, sympathized in their misery and burnt with the same healthful truth. But the slaveholders, revolted with indignation from the interference which thus arose with their tyrant powers, and exultingly spread the question, before the highest officers of the law. They had men to suit their purpose—York and Talbot, the Attorney and Solicitor General of the day, thoroughly imbued with the guilt of the day, recorded in 1729, the following infamous opinion:

"We are of opinion, that a slave coming from the West Indies into Great Britain or Ireland, either with or without

his master, does not become free—and that his master's right and property in him is not thereby determined or varied," &c.

Then exulted the slavemaster. Then sunk the soul of the slave. The last citadel on earth of liberty, seemed demolished—and man was let loose to prey upon man, without restraint. England became a slave market, and advertisements such as the following, disgraced the metropolis of *freedom!*

"PUBLIC ADVERTISER. Tuesday 28th Nov. 1769.
"To be sold, a black girl, the property of J. B.; eleven years of age, who is extremely handy, works at her needle tolerably, and speaks English perfectly well—is of an excellent temper and willing disposition. Enquire of Mr. Owen, at the Angel Inn, behind St. Clement's Church, in the Strand."

Mischief framed by law, yet *against law*, thus took deep root in Britain. And the crown and the nobles—and the monied interests—and the church and the bench and the bar, watered together the deadly plant. The whole nation seemed gone away with one consent, from God, and from law, and from its poor brother.

But God had more than seven thousand men in England, who had not bowed the knee to Baal. Rejoice, ye poor! the same God reigns forever, and the time is hastening when for you, He shall cry, as He cried for them "For the oppression of the poor—for the sighing of the needy—now will I arise, saith the Lord—I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him." Ps. xii. 5.

In 1765, David Lisle, a lawyer and a slave master of Barbadoes, then living in London, nearly killed one of his slaves, named Jonathan Strong, by most brutally beating him; and then turned him adrift in the streets. William Sharp, an eminent surgeon, Granville's brother, residing in the neighborhood, became acquainted with the facts and got Strong admitted to Bartholomew's Hospital. There he was partially cured—but his sight remained so dim in consequence of the wounds received on his head, that he continued to need aid from the brothers, and was by them put into the service of a benevolent apothecary, named Brown, in Fenchurch street. He served Brown about two

years, and was gradually recovering, when his former master, David Lisle, met and recognized him one day in the streets. David Lisle immediately laid his plan; had Strong seized soon after by legal authority, and lodged in the Poultry Compter. The poor man made known his case, as quickly as possible to Granville Sharp.

On the 18th September, 1767, the cause was tried at the Mansion House, and the Lord Mayor finding no evidence against him, told Strong that he was at liberty. "I seize him," grasping Strong's arm, exclaimed Captain Laird, who attended on the part of the prosecutor, "as the property of Mr. Kerr." "And *I* charge *you*," said Granville Sharp severely, tapping him on the shoulder, "for an assault." Capt. Laird, alarmed, immediately relinquished his lawless hold, and Strong went forth unimpeded.

For this procedure, Granville Sharp, was charged with *robbery*, by David Lisle, and received a challenge to give *gentlemanlike* satisfaction. "You are a lawyer," said Sharp, "and you shall want no satisfaction which the law can give you."

But the lawyers whom Sharp consulted declared that the laws were against him. Sir James Eyre, Recorder of the City, whom he retained as his counsel, adduced to him, York and Talbot's opinion, and informed him that Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, agreed with these gentlemen.

Did he yield; No—Not "like the tender blossom, warm in summer bowers" was he—but like the storm-rocked oak, which "each assailing blast, increase of strength supplies." Eternal law was written on his bosom—the eternal law of righteousness and love. He would not believe that the laws of his country could be so utterly at variance with it, and he determined to probe the matter to the bottom. He began an intense and comprehensive study of British law; and his enemies, dubious of their boasted grounds, artfully protracting the trial, allowed him all the leisure which he needed. In this difficult task, he had no instructor but God—no assistant, except his own diligence—no encourager, except his conscience. The result of his research was a tract, "*On the injustice and dangerous ten-*

dency of tolerating Slavery, or even of admitting the least claim to private property in the persons of men, in England." The arguments contained in it, were irresistible, and by its success, he amply fulfilled his promise to his antagonist. After about two years suspense, the prosecution was abandoned, and the plaintiff was compelled to pay treble costs for not bringing forward the action.

But the slaveholders, though once defeated, were not humbled. Tyrants do not readily repent or easily relax their grasp. The battle was but begun.

In 1770, an African named Thomas Lewis had left his master Mr. Stapylton, then residing in Chelsea (London.) Stapylton with the aid of two watermen whom he hired for the purpose, taking advantage of a dark night, seized Lewis, and after a struggle, dragged him off, gagging him as well as they could in the hurry. But his cries were providentially heard, and the ship to which he had been conveyed, being detained in the Downs by adverse weather, Lewis was brought back to London by writ of habeas corpus obtained and forwarded by the diligence of Granville Sharp, supported by Mrs. Banks, the mother of the celebrated traveler and naturalist Sir Joseph Banks. This rescue is described in the following words by Thomas Clarkson in his History of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade: "The vessel had reached the Downs and had actually got under way for the West Indies. In a few hours, it would have been out of sight. Just at this critical moment, the writ of *habeas corpus* was carried on board. The officer who served it saw the miserable captive chained to the mainmast, bathed in tears, and casting a last mournful look on the land of freedom. The Captain on receiving the writ became outrageous—but knowing the serious consequences of resisting the law of the land, he gave up his prisoner, whom the officer carried safe, but now weeping for joy to the shore." On the 12th July a bill was preferred and found by the Grand Jury of Middlesex against Stapylton, and the two watermen, Malony and Armstrong, in behalf of Lewis, "without the least

demur or doubt on account of the plaintiff's complexion or idea of *private property* urged against him."

On the 20th February, 1771, the trial was had at the King's Bench, Lord Chief Justice Mansfield presiding. But so fraught was Mansfield's mind still, with the false views of the day, that although the jury, found Stapylton "*guilty*," the *Chief Justice* (such is *justice* often in human hands!) refused to procced to judgment, and the criminals escaped. Against this proceeding of the judge, as against an open contempt of the laws of England, Sharp prepared a strong protest. The principles on which he proceeded, are thus expressed by himself, in a letter to Lord Carysport, in 1781: "This is the compendium or sum total of all my politics, so that I include them in a very small compass. I am thoroughly convinced that '*Right*' ought to be adopted and maintained, on all occasions, *without regard to consequences either probable or possible;* for *these* (when we have done our own duty as honest men) must *after all* be left to the *disposal* of Divine Providence, which has declared a blessing in favor of right, 'Blessed are the keepers of judgment—and he that doeth righteousness at all times.'" Ps. cvi. 3.

SECTION II.

But the general right to freedom in England was yet made a matter of opinion. No permanent security was obtained against the pertinacious avarice and tyranny of the slaveholders and slave-dealers. This question wanted decision and both parties wished it decided. The slave party, wrapt in selfishness and deluded by legal sophistries, felt confident in their claims—and the friends of liberty, clothed in righteousness and firm in everlasting truth, knew that British law, brought forth in its purity, would support

them. The case of James Somerset was chosen as the subject of trial.

This man had been brought to England in November, 1769, by his master, Charles Stewart, from Virginia, and in process of time, had left him. Stewart had had him suddenly seized and carried on board the Ann and Mary, Captain Knowles, in order to be taken to Jamacia and there sold for a slave.

On 7th February, 1772, the cause was tried in the King's Bench, before Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, aided by Justices Ashton, Welles and Ashurst. The question at issue was, "Is every man in England, entitled to the liberty of his person, unless forfeited by the Laws of England?" This was affirmed by the advocates of Somerset; and Mr. Sergeant Davy, who opened his cause broadly declared, "that no man at this day *is* or *can be*, a slave in England."

Mr. Davy supported this proposition by the most substantial documents drawn from the history of the country. He showed that the laws of England *alone*, rule in England; and that the laws of Virginia had no more validity in England, than the laws of Japan. He discussed the argument of *convenience*, on either side of the question—and concluded by stating the authorities, in various cases, by which it had been decided, that no man could here be the property of another. Of one of these, he thus spoke: "This was in the case of Cartwright, who brought a slave from Russia, and would scourge him. For this, he was questioned—and it was resolved, that *England was too pure an air for slaves to breathe in.*" (See Rushworth's Collections, p. 468.) "That was in the 11th of Queen Elizabeth. I hope my Lord, the air does not blow worse since—I hope they will never breathe here; for this is my assertion, 'the *moment they put their foot on English ground, that moment they become free.*' They are subject to the laws and they are entitled to the protection of the laws of this country; and so are their masters, thank God."

Mr. Sergeant Glynn followed and powerfully supported Davy.

Here Lord Chief Justice Mansfield was so impressed

with the weight of law in favor of liberty, yet so perplexed with the sophistries of *opinion* and *precedent*, that he deferred the further discussion of the case to the next *term*.

Granville Sharp availed himself with his usual zeal of this interval, and amongst the other measures by which he sought to secure an equitable decision, he addressed the following letter to Lord North, dated 18th February, 1772.

"My Lord—Presuming that information, concerning every question of a public nature, must of course be agreeable to your Lordship, I have ventured to lay before you a little tract, against tolerating slavery in England.

"His Majesty has been pleased lately to recommend to Parliament '*the providing new laws for supplying defects*, or *remedying abuses in such instances where it shall be requisite*,' and I apprehend my Lord, that there is no instance whatever, which requires more *immediate redress*, than the present miserable and deplorable slavery of Negroes and Indians, *as well as white English servants!!* in our *colonies*. I say, *immediate redress*, because *to be in power* and *to neglect, even a day*, in *endeavoring to put a stop*, to *such monstrous injustice and abandoned wickedness, must necessarily endanger a man's eternal welfare, be he ever so great in temporal dignity or office*.

"Nevertheless I don't mention this, as a subject proper for Parliamentary consideration: for the laws of England (God be thanked) are sufficiently clear with respect to *slavery in this island*. And though some enormous outrages have now and then been committed by ignorant masters, in attempting to carry off by force their quondam slaves, yet, if the Judges do their duty, by determining according to the laws already in force (for *Judicandum est Legibus, non Exemplis*' 4 Ca. 33, 'We must judge by *law* not by *precedent*,') there will be no necessity for Parliament to interfere.

"And with respect to the Colonies, the pernicious practice of slaveholding being tolerated by distinct laws of their own, cannot with propriety fall under the consideration of the British Parliament; for I am well aware, that no Parlia-

ment, can have a just right to enact laws for places, which it does not *represent.* The remedy of these notorious abuses therefore, rests entirely with the King and his Privy Council, to recommend to the several assemblies a formal repeal of those unjust laws of which I complain.

"I might alledge indeed, that many of the plantation laws (like every act that contains any thing which is *malum in se*, evil in its own nature) *are already null and void in themselves;* because they want every necessary foundation to render them valid, being absolutely contradictory to the laws of reason and natural equity, as well as to the laws of God. Yet, as many of them (to the disgrace of the English name) have been long in force, and have had the formal assent of kings, they will require a formal repeal by all the parties, in order to preserve, in each branch of the Legislature, that reciprocal faith, which is due to all solemn compacts. * * * * *

"I have also sent another book, on the same subject, lately printed at Philadelphia, which amongst other things worthy of notice, contains some sensible propositions for *abolishing slavery in the Colonies*, (see pages 138—141) and that your Lordship may see, the *absolute necessity* of such a measure I have likewise sent a short, lively representation in MS. of the present state of slavery in Maryland, extracted from a letter, dated in November last, from a gentleman in that province.

"Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Maryland, to a friend in London:

"'But whether I shall go thither or return home, I am yet undetermined; indeed no where shall I stay long from England; for I had much rather enjoy the bare necessaries of life there, than the most affluent circumstances in this country of most wretched slavery. * * * There are four things under the sun, which I equally abhor and abominate, viz. *slavery, licentiousness, pride* and *impudence*, all which abound here, in a monstrous degree.

"'The punishments of the poor negroes and convicts, are beyond all conception, being entirely subject to the will of their savage and brutal masters. They are often

punished for not doing more than strength and nature will admit of; and sometimes because they cannot on every occasion, fall in with their wanton and capricious humors. One punishment is to flay their backs with cow-hides, or other instruments of barbarity, and then pour on hot rum, superinduced with brine or pickle, rubbed in with a corn husk. in the scorching heat of the sun. For certain, if your judges were sensible of the shocking treatment of the convicts here, they would hang every one of them, as infinitely less punishment; and transport only those, whose crimes deserve the severest death. Better be hanged seven hundred times, than serve seven years here: and there is no redress, for magistrates and all, are equally interested and criminal. If I had a child, I had rather see him, the humblest scavenger in the streets of London, than the loftiest tyrant in America, with a thousand slaves at his beck.'.

Old Jewry, 18th February, 1772."

In connexion with this letter, Granville Sharp adverting to the existing slave laws of the Colonies, says in his Journal of the same day, (18th Feb. 1772) "If such laws are not *absolutely necessary* for the government of slaves, the law-makers must unavoidably allow themselves to be the *most cruel and abandoned tyrants* upon earth, and perhaps, that *ever were on earth*. But, on the other hand, if it be said that it is *impossible* to govern *slaves, without such inhuman severity and detestable injustice*, the same is an invincible argument against the *least toleration* of slavery among christians; because *temporal profits*, cannot compensate the forfeiture of everlasting welfare—*that the cries of these much injured people will certainly reach heaven*—that the scriptures denounce a tremendous judgment against the man, who shall offend *one little one*—that it were *better* for *the nation* that their *American dominions* had *never existed*, or even that they had *sunk in the sea*, than that the *kingdom of Great Britain* should be *loaded* with the *horrid guilt* of *tolerating such abominable wickedness*," &c.

It ought to be remembered that while Granville Sharp, thus boldly remonstrated with the Government of his coun.

try, he filled a government situation and was dependant for his present subsistence, and for his future prospects in life, upon the Ministry of the day.

The tract above mentioned as having lately been printed in Philadelphia, was from the pen of the excellent Anthony Benezet, a brother in heart and in deed of Granville Sharp.

On 9th May, the trial of Somerset's case, was resumed.

Mr. Mansfield conducted the defence. He contended, that "If Somerset was a man—and he should conclude him one, till proved otherwise—he could not be a slave in England. The dispute," he said, "was between one human creature and another, the master and the negro, *whether the latter was entitled to the important rights which nature had given him.* To the charge that he was a slave, the negro might very well answer, 'True, I *was* a slave; *torn* from my mother's arms, I was put in chains on board a *British ship* and carried to *America*—I was there placed under a master, from whose tyranny, I could not escape: if I had attempted it, I should have been exposed to the severest punishment; and never from the first moment of my life to the present time, have I been in a situation to assert the common rights of mankind. I am now in a country where the rights of liberty are known and regarded; and can you tell me the reason, why I am not to be protected by those laws?' To have such a question answered," continued Mr. Mansfield, "consistently with those laws, seems to me impossible—for, on the contrary, he is as fully and clearly entitled to the protection of those laws, as any one who now hears me."

At the end of Mr. Mansfield's speech, the case was adjourned to the 14th May.

Mr. Hargrave then proceeded with the defence.

"If," said he, "the claim of Stewart over Somerset, be here recognized, domestic slavery, with its horrid train of evils, may be lawfully imported into this country, at the discretion of every foreigner or native. It will come, not only from our own Colonies, but from Poland, Russia, Spain and Turkey—from the coast of Barbary; from the eastern and western coasts of Africa; from every part of

the world, where it still continues to torment and dishonor the human species." He then examined, 1st. The *right* claimed by Stewart over the person of Somerset—and 2d. The authority on which that *right* was rested. He declared that in "whatever light we view it, *slavery* is alike pernicious to the person who *suffers* it, to the person who *inflicts* it, and to the government which allows its existence." He traced the history of European negro slavery—recorded the interesting fact, that Charles V. in 1740, abolished it in his dominions; and the greedy and disgraceful return to it of the masters, as soon as the imperial prohibition could be evaded. He traced the history of Villeinage in England, and demonstrated that no right could thereon be founded to the claims of the slaveholder.

Mr. Alleyne closed the proceedings on the same side. He examined the distinction between *natural* and *municipal* rights—the one of which attaches alike to all men in every country—the other is peculiar to times, circumstances and places. "The *right of slavery*," he continued, "not being from nature, cannot be imported from another country. *Natural relations*, are inherent in the nature of things, and nothing can annul them. They arise from the relation which a man bears to mankind in general; and his moral duty results from them. He cannot therefore, change his natural relations—they are universal. *Municipal relations* are such as arise from being a member of the particular country, where they exist. It appears that by the laws of Virginia, this man is a slave—but the laws of Virginia, rule not in England. In this country, how can this man be a slave, where the meanest have a title to enjoy the rights of freedom. This man is *here*. He owes submission to the laws of England, and he has a corresponding right to the protection of these laws—he claims that protection—and when" added he, "the judgment of this Court is given, Stewart, as well as the rest of the slaveholders, will know, that *this* air is too *free* for a *slave* to *breathe* in."

The cause of the slave party was supported by two able and eloquent men, Messrs. Wallace and Dunning. Mr. Wallace spoke immediately after Mr. Alleyne, and dwelt

mainly upon the inconvenience, absurdity and *injustice* of divesting a man of his *rightful* property ! ! *only* because he sailed, in pursuit of his lawful business, from one country to another ! !

The cause was adjourned to the 21st. The confidence of Lord Mansfield, in York and Talbot's judgment, was plainly shaken ; but his leaning was yet clearly to their opinion.

On the 21st the trial was resumed, and Mr. Dunning supported the claims of despotism. Confounding the relation of *master and servant*, with the relation of *master and slave*, he insisted upon the universal and indispensable necessity of that relation. Mr. Davy replied, and tore his cobweb to pieces.

Lord Mansfield delayed judgment, and twice threw out a suggestion, "that the master might put an end to the present litigation by manumitting the slave ;" but the base suggestion was providentially not attended to. The judgment was demanded ; and the judgment was given on Monday, 22d June, 1772. After much lawyer-like circumlocution, Lord Mansfield decided as follows :

"Immemorial usage preserves the memory of *positive law*, long after all traces of the occasion, reason, authority and time of its introduction are lost ; and in a *case so odious as the condition of slaves*, must be *taken strictly* ; (*tracing* the subject to natural principles, the *claim of slavery never can be supported.*) The *power* claimed by *this return, never was in use here.* We cannot say the cause set forth by this return, is allowed or approved of by the laws of this kingdom, and therefore the man must be discharged."

Here some important facts and observations present themselves. In this case, we have 1st. a most instructive and delightful instance of the power of truth—and of the impartial justice of British law. The iniquitous web of *legality* is unwoven. The perversions of legislation, originating in the highest authorities, supported by the greatest names, defended by a powerful faction and assented to by almost every body, are detected and swept away. Law, ceasing to frame mischief, is restored to its own wholesome

and glorious character, as the handmaid of equity—and one of the first lawyers of the age, placed at the fountain head of justice, and freed by the gathered effulgence of truth, from the sophisms of his character and his class, casts off his prejudices and restores to liberty, her resting place on earth.

2d. We have a deplorable instance of the corruptions of legal practice. Mr. Dunning, who supported tyranny in the case of Somerset, had *previously* been one of the most bright and efficient defenders of liberty. He was the chief advocate in the case of Thomas Lewis, in 1771, and then triumphantly declared, that *no man can be legally detained as a slave in England.* Granville Sharp's observations upon this tergiversation, are worthy of record, and should ring like warning thunder upon every lawyer's heart. "This is an abominable and insufferable practice in lawyers, to undertake causes diametrically opposite to their own declared opinions of law and justice."

3d. We are encouraged in assailing wickedness, however inveterate it may have grown—however fearful the power which supports it—however great the influence and the talent and the learning which may be arrayed in its defence! In the case before us, *perversion* of law, supported by the practice of almost half a century, had become as law itself. The abuse was admitted into all the courts, and was sustained by almost every lawyer. The fountains of justice were corrupted; and the *tyrant* doctrine of *right* being confined to a particular class, while another class was mercilessly bereaved of *every right,* lorded it over the land. Britain, in boasting of liberty, was a hypocrite; for her liberty was licentiousness; the *dreadful licentiousness* practiced by the *learned and rich,* of plundering and oppressing without remorse, the ignorant and the poor. In the midst of this wickedness, a man with a single eye to God, arose! What was darkness through sophistry, to the highest intellects and to the deepest scholarship of the mighty minds around him, to him was light. No selfishness—no partiality—no prejudice—no pride—no fear or idolatry of man, clouded the light of eternal equity and love, which burnt in his bo-

som. He moved right on, as his Saviour led him; and others, won by the loveliness of truth shining in him, came up with him to the advocacy of righteousness. Satan raged—then trembled—then fell—and the fresh ocean air of Britain again became too pure for a slave to breathe in. It may here be observed, that Stewart, in prosecuting his tyrant claim against Somerset, was supported by the mighty influence and wealth of the West Indian faction.

4th. We are taught the liability to the basest influences of the finest minds—and the consequent danger of resting upon human opinion.

In the beginning of his researches, Granville Sharp had found and *noted* the following passage in Blackstone's Commentaries, Book I, page 123, edition 1st.- "And this spirit of liberty, is so deeply implanted in our Constitution, and rooted even in our very soil, that a slave or a negro, the moment he lands in England, falls under the protection of the laws, and with regard to all national rights, becomes *eo instanti* a freeman."

This passage being quoted in one of the trials, was triumphantly repelled by the opposite counsel, who produced the volume from which the quotation was made, and instead of the words as noted by Granville Sharp, read as follows: "A negro, the moment he lands in England, falls under the protection of the laws, and so far becomes a freeman; though the master's right to his service may possibly remain." Upon further investigation, it was found that in the course of the trials, Dr. Blackstone himself, had made this alteration in the subsequent editions; thus exhibiting man's dreadful liability to corrupt influence, and the greatness of the debt of gratitude which we owe to God, for raising up in the moment of emergency, such a vindicator of his truth as Granville Sharp.

Thus were the British Isles delivered from slavery. Thus became they cities of refuge for the slave! Let him but land there, and miserable as the roof might be under which he slept, he slept in safety! No more was he liable to be hunted through the streets as a beast of prey! He walked secure by the side of the stately ship, and feared no

longer a dungeon in her hold. He was free to exercise his industry, and secure in the fruits of his toil. His wife was *his* wife, and his children *his* children, and no longer the property of a tyrant—and no more went up the cry of his wrongs and of his blood to God against the land.

It is true indeed, that for a considerable time after this, the country was disgraced at times, by ignorant or lawless men; as for instance, in 1779 the following advertisement was made at Liverpool, on 15th October; "To be sold by auction, at George Dunbar's office, on Thursday next, the 21st inst., at one o'clock, a black boy, about fourteen years old," &c. But these were merely as the last lashings of the wave, when the storm recedes from the shore. They have long ceased.*

SECTION III.

On 22d June, 1772, the day on which it was judged in Sergeant Davy's words, by Lord Mansfield's decision, that "as soon as any slave, sets his foot on English ground, *he becomes free*," Granville Sharp received a letter from Anthony Benezet, and for several years after kept up a correspondence with him on the most important subjects of humanity and of practical religion. Benezet, in his first letter, dated Philadelphia, 14th of 5th month, (May) 1772, urges Sharp to attack the African slave trade, and speaks of the disposition of thousands in Maryland and Virginia, to support him with petitions. "The people of New England," he says, "have made a law, that nearly amounts to a prohibition of the trade, and I am informed, have proposed to the Governor and Council, that all negroes born in the country, should be free at a certain age. I know the flood of impiety and selfishness, which as a torrent seems

* Note, see Appendix, No. I., for some of the principles of eternal and British Law, on which Granville Sharp proceeded.

to overflow, will be a great discouragement: but, let us remember, *that the Lord's power*, is above the power of darkness!! *His* hand is not shortened, that it cannot save *by few*, as well as by many."

Sharp, replying in a letter dated Old Jewry, London, August 21, 1772, declares his cordial sympathy with the writer, and urges petitions "*against the toleration of slavery in the Colonies*."

Sharp's correspondence was subsequently extended to Benjamin Franklin, and to Dr. Rush. In a letter of the latter, dated Philadelphia, 1st May, 1773, are the following interesting words: "A spirit of humanity and religion begins to awaken, in several of the Colonies, in favor of the poor negroes. The clergy begin to bear a public testimony against this violation of the laws of nature and christianity. Great events have been brought about by small beginings. Anthony Benezet stood alone a few years ago, in opposing negro slavery in Philadelphia; and now three-fourths of the province, as well as of the city, cry out against it," &c.

Sharp, in the course of this correspondence with America, was led to investigate the nature of the contest between the Colonies and the mother country, and in 1774, published a tract, entitled "A declaration of the people's natural rights to a share in the Legislature, which is the fundamental principle of the British Constitution." Of this he gave 250 copies to Dr. Franklin, who despatched them to America the same day. The tract was immediately and extensively republished in the Colonies. In this tract, he displayed the intrepid and impartial love which ever glowed in his bosom, for "the real rights of men." He saw the Colonies oppressed, and he became at once their advocate. Happy indeed, for them and for the world would it have been, if *their* love for *rights*, had been impartial and magnanimous like his. *Then indeed*, had slavery ceased with the dominion of Britain from the United States, and instead of remaining as they now emphatically are, "the land of the brave and *the home of the slave*," they would have been, with a glory before unknown to earth, "the land of the brave and the home of the free."

On 28th July, 1775, accounts reached the Ordnance Board, at Westminster, of the battle of Charlestown, near Boston, and Granville Sharp, immediately making known to his superiors in office, his sentiments in relation to the contest, and his repugnance to all war, took a furlough of two months, in hopes that peace might yet be restored. The following extract from a letter, as his furlough was expiring, to Mr. Boddington, the officer in charge of the department, is quite in character: "Bamburgh Castle, Northumberland, 26th Sept. 1775; Dear Sir—As the term of my absence will expire in a few days, and there is not yet any change of public measures respecting America, though the petition lately brought over by Mr. Penn, had given me some hopes of it, I now begin to be anxious about my own particular situation; for, as my opinions on that subject are established, I cannot return to my ordnance duty, whilst a bloody war is carried on, unjustly as I conceive, against my fellow subjects: and yet, to resign my place, would be to give up a calling, which by my close attendance to it for nearly eighteen years, and by my neglect of every other means of subsistence during so long a period, is now become my only profession and livelihood," &c. His furlough was readily prolonged; but on 10th April, 1777, all hopes of peace having ceased, he finally resigned his office. Thus stood the protector of the helpless, destitute himself of the means of subsistence. But his brothers, James and William, proved brothers indeed. They revered that sacred sense of duty which had deprived him of a handsome provision, and they strove together to compensate his loss. His company, always a treasure to them, was now doubly dear, and for several years he became their companion and guest. The following lines, some time previously, were addressed to him by —— Payne, Esq., one of the Directors of the Bank of England:

"Wise, learned, meek, with reverential love
Of God's just laws, and love of man full fraught,
O may thy labors by the midnight lamp
Pour day's effulgence on thy country's darkness;
Teach lawyers rectitude—teach statesmen truth—
Teach tyrants justice; and the willing hind,

Lord of his little freehold, teach to prize
His deep responsibilities, and deem
His own rights sacred as the rights of monarchs.
But should the voice of warning not be heard;
Should this devoted nation, left of God,
Worship hell's blackest demon, lawless power;
And driven by pride and wrath, precipitate
Her hasty strides, through streams of kindred blood
Hastening to dissolution—Then, Oh then
May thy just spirit, gentle, humble, firm,
Marking with pitying eye the storm of wrath,
Rise peaceful to its native heaven,
All buoyant on the wing of spotless liberty."

In 1775, Omai, a native of Waieta, was brought to England. Granville Sharp hoping through him to benefit his native land, sought his acquaintance and devoted a portion of leisure to his instruction. At one of their meetings, the following conversation took place. Omai, like all his people, was addicted to polygamy, and had no idea of its cruelty and turpitude—but he was endowed with that native intelligence, that natural power of discriminating between right and wrong, which is independent of learning, and which is often fairest in the most uncultivated minds. Granville Sharp thus records the conversation:

"When sitting with him at table one day after dinner, I thought it a good opportunity to explain to him the ten commandments. I proceeded with tolerable success, in reciting the first six. He had nothing to object against any of them, though many explications were required, before he understood all the terms; and he freely nodded his assent. But when I recited the seventh commandment, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery;' he cried, 'Adultery! what that? what that?'

"It is I said, that if a man has got one wife, he must not take another wife, or any other woman. 'Oh,' said he, 'two wives, very good—three wives, very, very good.' No, Omai, said I, not so—that would be contrary to the first principle of the law of nature. 'First principle of law of nature,' said he, 'what that? what that?' *The first principle of the law of nature is,* I said, *that no man must do to another person, any thing that he would not like to be*

done to himself. For example, suppose you, Omai, have got a wife that you love very much—would you like another man to come and love your wife? This raised his indignation—he put on a furious countenance and a threatening posture, signifying that he would kill any man that should meddle with his wife. Well then, Omai, I said, suppose that your wife loves you very much, she would not like that you should love another woman. For women have the same passions and feelings and love towards man, which we have towards woman—and we ought, therefore, to regulate our behavior towards them, by our own feelings of what we should like and expect of faithful love and duty from them, towards ourselves.

"This new view of the case produced a deep consideration and silence for some time on the part of Omai. But he soon satisfied me that he thoroughly comprehended the due influence of *the law of liberty*, when it is applied to regulate, by our own feelings, the conduct and behavior, which we owe to others. There was an inkstand on the table with several pens in it. He took one pen and laid it on the table—'there lies Lord S——,' said he. Then he took another pen and laid it down by the side of the first, and said, 'there lies Miss W——,' (an accomplished young lady who lived in adultery with Lord S——;) and then taking a third pen, and laying it on the table as far as his arm could reach from the other two, he reclined his elbow on the table and resting his head on his hand, in a pensive posture, he said, 'and there lies Lady S—— and cry—cry!'"

The heart of Granville Sharp, shrunk like the sensitive plant, from the very touch of pollution—and it responded buoyantly to every call of truth and law, as the damask rose expands when heaven with the returning summer again showers life and beauty over the earth.

On 26th September, 1776, he received the following letter from a new friend:

"Sir—Being at Woolston Hall, Dr. Scott's house, he showed me your 'Law of Retribution.' I was greatly rejoiced to find, that so laborious and learned a man, had

appeared as champion for the rights of mankind, against avarice, extortion and inhumanity—that you had, with an heroic courage, dared to press home on an infidel, luxurious world, the dreadful threats of the Lord. The ruins of Babylon, Memphis and Tyre, are strong mementos to a Lisbon, a London, and a Paris, of the recompense paid to those, who fat their luxuries, on the labor of wretched slaves.

"The Portuguese, were the first of the western Christians, who allowed slavery; their adventurers stole men from Guinea and sold them as slaves. On Lisbon, the judgment has fallen. An unnatural war between us and America, seems to denote the second—you fairly open up the third, &c. &c. JAMES OGLETHORPE."

In a subsequent letter, dated Cranham Hall, 13th October, 1776, General Oglethorpe supplies the following deeply interesting historical facts:

"My friends and I settled the colony of Georgia, and by Charter were established Trustees, to make laws, &c. *We determined not to suffer slavery there.* But the slave merchants and their adherents, occasioned us not only much trouble, but at last got the then government to favor them. We would not suffer slavery (which is against the Gospel as well as the fundamental law of England) to be authorized under our authority; we refused as Trustees, to make a law permitting such a horrid crime. The Government finding the Trustees resolved firmly not to concur with what they believed unjust, took away the charter by which no law could be passed without our consent. * * *

"This cruel custom of a *private man's* being supported in exercising *more power* over the man whom he *affirms to have bought as his slave,* than the *magistrate* has *over the master,* is a *solecism* in politics. This, I think was taken from the Romans. The horrid cruelty, which that proud nation showed in all they did, gave such power to the masters of slaves, that they confused even the state.* Decius Brutus, by the gladiators, his slaves, defended the

* See Georgia and South Carolina lately.

conspirators that killed the Dictator Cæsar. The cruelty of the slave masters occasioned the slaves to join Spartacus, who almost overturned Rome, &c.

"I find in Sir Walter Raleigh's history of the Saracens, that *their* success, and the destruction of the Grecian and Persian empires, were chiefly owing to the Greeks and Persians having such vast numbers of slaves, by whom all labor and husbandry were carried on. And on the Saracens' giving freedom to all who professed their law, the multitude, in every conquered province, joined them. * *

"The christian Emperors would have qualified the laws of slavery—but the Senate of Rome, in whom the old leaven of idolatry still prevailed, stopped such good designs.* St. Austin, in his "De Civitate Dei," mentions that idolatry was sunk into the marrow of the Romans—that the destruction of Rome by the Goths seemed necessary to root out idolatry. The Goths and all the northern nations, when converted to Christianity, abolished slavery. The husbandry was performed by men under the protection of the laws. Though some tenures of villienage were too severe, yet the villien had the protection of law; and their lords could not exact more than was by the laws regulated," (Bracton,) &c.

About this time, General Oglethorpe published, "The Sailor's Advocate," against the impressment of seamen, and Sharp supplied a pungent *introduction* to it. Thus they continued to strengthen one another in their sacred ardor for holy, impartial, social liberty. Amongst Sharp's sentiments on this subject, the following particularly strike me.

"In short, the doctrine of necessity, may be admitted to excuse some things of *an indifferent* nature, *not evil* in themselves, though prohibited by law; but *never* to justify *iniquity and oppression, respect of persons*, or *any thing* that

* How similar this to Britain and the United States. Britain under a King, has abolished Slavery. The United States, a republic, clasps it as her dearest jewel. The National Legislature, will not or dares not, *even* discuss it—and the highest judicatories of the Churches deem themselves insulted when it is fairly offered to their attention.

is '*malum in se*, evil in its very nature.' Because the *first necessity* in a Christian community is, *to do justice to all men, at all times*—as, *it is better to endure all adversities, than to assent to iniquity.*

"The end or purpose of all good government is liberty, with protection from personal injuries, and the security of private property; but when a large part of the community are deprived of their liberty and protection, not for a short time only, but regularly and constantly, the end or true purpose of government is defeated and destroyed.

"This doctrine is deeply impressed in the genius of our common law, which informs us, by unquestionable maxims, that no man is worthy to hold the reins of administration who cannot maintain *the national justice*, the chief object of which is certainly, *personal protection.* '*Cessa regnare, si non vis judicare,' Cease to reign, if you will not do justice*, and the reason of this is plain from another maxim, '*Vita Reipublicæ, pax—et animus libertas—et corpus, leges,*' peace is the life—and liberty the soul—and the laws the body of the commonwealth."

In another place, Sharp quotes the following in corroboration of the same views. "Humana natura in libertatis causâ, favorem semper magis quam in aliis causis deprecatur;' and 'Anglica jura, in omni causa. libertati dant favorem,' human nature gives a preference to the cause of liberty, above all other causes, and 'the laws of England always favor liberty.' (Fortescue.)"

He says, in his manuscripts, "I have been told that it is the common lot of the poor and laborious part of mankind, to endure hardships and inconveniences. That the pressing and forcing them into service, is no injustice or illegality, being nothing more than a necessary contingency of their low condition of life, in which they were bred; and that the cruelty rather rests with persons, who like me take notice of their grievances, and render them unhappy, by persuading them, that they are so. All this has been urged to me, with the most plausible sophistry, and important self-sufficiency, as if the speaker supposed that the mere sound of words, could alter the nature of things;

or as if, there were no distinction between good and evil, but as the circumstances of persons, or occasions, might render it expedient or necessary to practice the one or the other. Thus the tyrant's plea of necessity, is made to remove every boundary of law, morality and common right. But 'woe to them that call evil good, and good evil.' Happy would it be for this nation, and for the souls of such as mislead it, if the feelings of the seamen and other laborious poor, had no other stimulant than the recital of their unhappy case by such poor advocates as I. Are they not surely of the same blood, and have they not the same natural knowledge of good and evil, to discern? and the same sensibility to injuries, as those who cause their sufferings?

"It is to prevent and dissuade from acts of violence and injustice, and surely not to aggravate the sense of them, that such circumstances are noticed. Nay, it is charity towards the oppressors as well as the oppressed, to endeavor to convince the oppressors of their error—and how *can* this be done but by exhibiting the oppressions. It is a crime to be silent on such occasions; for the scriptures command, 'open thy mouth—judge righteously and plead the cause of the poor and needy.' Prov. xxxi. 9. Nay, it is the cause of God himself, who has declared, 'for the oppressor of the poor reproacheth his Maker; but he that honoreth him, hath mercy on the poor.'" Prov. xiv. 31.

During all this time, Granville Sharp continued his correspondence on the subject of slavery and the slave trade. He particularly urged the Bench of Bishops, and visited most of them personally. A few cordially met his views.* In a letter to the Archbishop of York, he says:

"The Methodists also are highly offended at the scandalous toleration of slavery in our Colonies, if I may judge by the sentiments of one of their principal teachers, Mr. Wesley: though indeed I have never had any communication with that gentleman, but on this particular point.

* These were particulaly (1779) the Archbishop of Canterbery. Bishops of Litchfield, St. David's, St. Asaph, London, Ely, Bangor, Oxford and Peterborough.

"One of the leading people likewise among the Moravians, has written me several very earnest letters upon the subject. Nay even the church of Rome, has been honored by the endeavors of one of her sons, the benevolent and indefatigable Bishop of Chiapa, (*Las Casas*) against this crying sin."*

In 1783, his attention was called to the case of the ship Zong or Zung.

This vessel, Luke Collingwood, master, sailed from St. Thomas, off the coast of Africa, for Jamaica, with 440 slaves and 14 whites on board, Sept. 6th, 1781. In November, she made Jamaica; but the master mistaking it, as he said, for Hispaniola, ran her to leeward. Sickness and mortality dreadfully prevailed, so that by 29th Nov. 60 slaves and 7 whites had died, besides a great number being dangerously ill. The master then made a proposal to his officers to throw the sick slaves into the sea, because, said he, if they die on board, the loss will fall upon the owners of the ship—but if they are thrown overboard for the preservation of the ship, the underwriters will have to bear it; besides, it will be mercy to save them from a lingering

* An absurd and cruel charge, has been widely spread against this holy man, at first on the authority of the Spanish historian, Herrera, and after him, of Robertson and Charlevoix, &c., who copy from Herrera that, led away by his fond pity for the perishing Indians, he recommended the African slave trade as a substitute. This calumny has been triumphantly refuted by the Abbe Gregoire, in the 4th Vol. of the Transactions of the Class of Moral and Political Sciences of the French Institute. The grounds of the refutation may be here briefly stated.

Herrera wrote thirty years after the death of Las Casas and displays much enmity towards him, and he quotes no authority whatsoever for his assertions. Several writers were cotemporary with Las Casas, some of whom were his enemies and endeavored to render him odious and contemptible—but none of them mention this charge.

Sepulveda was his personal antagonist. Lopez de Gomara, in his "General History of the Indies," defames him in other respects—yet neither mentions this accusation. Remesal, author of the history of Chiapa and Guatimala, is silent respecting it. Don Juan Lopez and Racine, both authors of ecclesiastical histories, eulogize him greatly, but say nothing of it. His own memoirs, written by himself, deposited in the libraries of Mexico and Madrid, in several places mention the African slaves, and express the same commiseration for their sufferings, as so remarkably distinguished him to the Indians. See also Preface to Clarkson's Essay on the Slavery and Commerce of the human species.

death. To this, James Kelsal, the mate, at first objected. But the master, soon gained over the crew, and the work of death began.

One hundred and thirty-two of the slaves were brought on deck, and the crew began by turns to throw them into the sea. "*A parcel*" of fifty-four were first drowned. The next day "another parcel" of forty-two, were committed to the deep: and on the third day, the remaining thirty-six, were brought up for execution; but offering some resistance, twenty-six were first put into irons, and then thrown overboard. The remaining ten, animated by despair, sprang disdainfully from the grasp of their murderers, and buried themselves in the ocean.

The pretense of the master was, that a scarcity of water rendered the execution necessary—but this was abundantly disproved.

Nevertheless, the verdict of the jury on the first trial, was in favor of the master and the owners!!! and the Solicitor General, *J. Lee!* spurned the idea of carrying the cause further. He asserted the *unquestionable* right of the master to do as he had done. "This is a case," said he, "of *goods and chattels*. It is really so: it is a case of throwing over goods; for to this purpose and the purpose of insurance, they are goods and property—*whether right or wrong*, we have nothing to do with it"!!

Mr. Pigot, on the part of the underwriters, said, "The life of one man, is like the life of another man, whatever the complexion is. Suppose the exigency described had existed—I ground myself on the rights and essential interests of humanity; I contend, that as long as any water remained, these men were as much entitled to their share, as the captain, or any other man whatever."

Lord Mansfield, regarding the matter with a legal eye, declared, "The matter left to the jury, is 'was it from necessity'"?—"for they had no doubt (*though it shocks one very much*) that the case of *slaves*, was the same as if *horses* had been thrown overboard!! *It is a very shocking case.*" He granted a new trial.

The result, was a verdict in favor of the underwriters.

But so thoroughly corrupt and ferocious in this particular, was the state of legality then in England, that no prosecution could be had of the murderers. The pecuniary claims of the underwriters were vindicated—but the blood of the poor was despised. Its cry is going to meet its tyrants and their fellows, where persons are not respected; where *He* presides, who has declared "Vengeance is mine—I will repay, saith the Lord."

"So far," said J. Lee, the counsel of the owners, "so far was the transaction from any thing like the guilt of a murderous act; or any shew or suggestion of cruelty, or even a surmise of impropriety, that to bring a charge of murder against the perpetrators, would argue nothing less than madness." Such, at times, is the worse than lawlessness of law! So fearfully true is it, that "*no tyranny is more cruel, than that which is exercised under the shadow of law, and with the pretense of justice.*" Witness slavery as it now exists in the United States.

It is most pleasing to contrast, with this utter abandonment in wickedness, the following words of Granville Sharp, extracted from a letter dated Old Jewry, 18th July, 1783, addressed by him, to His Grace the Duke of Portland: "but only wish, by the horrible example related in the enclosed papers, (the case of the Zong) to warn your Grace, that there is an absolute necessity to abolish the slave trade and West Indian slavery; and that 'to be in power, and to neglect, as life (and I may say, the tenure of office,) is very uncertain, even a day, endeavoring to put a stop to such monstrous injustice and abandoned wickedness, must necessarily endanger a man's eternal welfare, be he ever so great in temporal dignity or office.'"

The extravagance of wickedness, however, which thus with brazen front, polluting openly the streams of law, not only screened these murderers from punishment, but gave them heart as above, to scoff at the very idea of justice, reacted with powerful effect, upon many of the first minds in the nation; and prepared the way for that glorious and wholesome overthrow of despotism, beneath the sacred and advancing influences of which, the world is reviving. Such

is *now*, the growing process in the United States. The following note, exhibits the process *then* in England.

Dr. Hinchcliff, Bishop of Peterborough, to Granville Sharp, Esq.

"*Peterborough*, 31*st Aug.* 1783.

Dear Sir—I return to you the inclosed narrative of one of the most inhuman barbarities that I ever read of. Were religion and humanity attended to, there can be no doubt, that the horrid traffic would entirely cease; but *they have too small a voice, to be heard among the clamors of avarice and ambition.* Your benevolent endeavors to assist the wretched Africans, however unsuccessful in *their* favor, cannot be so in *your own.* As a friend to mankind, permit me to thank you, &c. (signed) J. Peterborough."

In July, 1786, Sharp's attention was arrested by an alarming emergency. He was suddenly informed that a negro named Harry Demane, had just been kidnapped by his master, —— Jeffrey's Esq., and sent on ship-board. He immediately put himself in action to secure a rescue; but legal difficulties, through the indisposition of the magistrates to do their duty, &c., so perplexed him, that all his knowledge and all his energy were put into requisition. At length the requisite writ of *habeas corpus*, being procured, Savage and Green were despatched with it, in pursuit of the ship on Saturday night, 29th July. By Monday noon, 31st, they were back in London, with the rescued slave. They found the ship with the anchor weighing, the sails set and the captain at the helm. Henry Demane declared that he had determined to jump into the sea, as soon as it was dark, preferring death to slavery. In this deliverance, Sharp adoringly acknowledged the benignant Providence which thus cheered him in his holy struggle.

The following is an extract of a letter, addressed to him by Dr. Franklin, dated Philadelphia, 9th June, 1787.

"From a most grateful sense of the zeal and abilities, with which you have long and successfully defended the oppressed Africans, the Society (*The Pennsylvania Society for promoting the Abolition of Slavery, &c.*) have done themselves the honor of enrolling your name, in the num-

ber of *corresponding members*, and they earnestly request the continuance of your labors in the great object of their institution; for, in this business, the friends of humanity in every country, are of one nation and religion, &c.

B. FRANKLIN."

The excellent John Jay wrote as follows, from New-York, 1st Sept. 1788.

"The society established in this city for promoting the manumission of slaves, &c., did, at their last meeting, admit you an honorary member of it, and I have now the pleasure of transmitting to you, herewith enclosed, a certified extract from their minutes on that subject, &c.

JOHN JAY, *President*."

In reply to Dr. Franklin, Leadenhall Street, London, 10th Jan. 1788, Sharp writes:

"I have read, with very particular satisfaction, their excellent remonstrance against slavery, addressed to the late convention.*

"When such solemn and unanswerable appeals to the consciences of men, in behalf of humanity and common justice, are disregarded, the crimes of slave dealing and slave holding become crying sins, which presumptuously invite the Divine retribution. So that it must be highly dangerous to the political existence of any state, thus duly warned against injustice, to afford the least sanction to such enormities by their legislative authority."

"Having always been *zealous for the honor of free governments*, I am the more sincerely grieved, to see the new Federal Constitution stained, by the insertion of two most exceptionable clauses of the kind above mentioned. The one, in direct opposition to a most humane article, ordained by the first American Congress, to be perpetually observed; and the other, in equal opposition to an express command

* The convention here spoken of, is the convention which adopted the Federal Constitution in 1787, (signed "Washington.") The remonstrance mentioned, is the remonstrance of "The Pennsylvania Society for promoting the Abolition of Slavery," against the security given by that Constitution to the African slave trade, by prohibiting its abolition prior to 1808, or for twenty-one years, Article 1, Section 9; and against the clause for restoring refugee slaves, Article 3, Section 2.

of the Almighty, '*not to deliver up the servant that has escaped from his master*,' &c. Both clauses, however, the 9th Section of the 1st Article, and the latter part of the 2d Section of the 3d Article, are so clearly null and void by their iniquity, that it would be even a crime to regard them as law."

In September, 1786, the College of Providence, in Rhode Island, conveyed to him through her President, the highest honor which they could bestow, the degree of Doctor of Laws; and the University of Cambridge, in Massachusetts, and of Williamsburgh, in Virginia, soon afterwards did the same. I have before me, the affectionate letter, dated, Feb. 25th, 1791, addressed to Dr. Willard, President of the University of Cambridge, in which he reciprocates the friendship of that institution.

The following letter gives a trait of that more retired beneficence, of which generally, there is no record but with God.

"*Philadelphia, 25th Nov.* 1793.

WORTHY AND RESPECTED SIR—We want words to express our gratitude to you, for all your labors of love to our afflicted nation. You were our advocate when we had but few friends on the other side of the water. We request you to accept of our thanks, for all your kind and benevolent exertions in behalf of the people of our color, and particularly for your late humane donation to our church.

"Our prayers shall not cease to ascend to the Father of Mercies, and God of all grace for your health and happiness in this world, and your eternal happiness in the world to come—we are, &c.

ABSALOM JONES,
WILLIAM GREY,
WILLIAM GARDNER,

Acting Officers of the African Church of Philadelphia."

Before we conclude this section, we may notice, that upon the dissension of the Continental Colonies with Great Britain, and their subsequent separation, much difficulty arose in the Canonical ordination of the Episcopalian Bishops, in the United States; and that Granville Sharp, a consciencious Episcopalian, was mainly instrumental in ob-

viating the objections which the dignitaries of the English Church, made to the requisite consecrations. His attention appears to have been first directed to this subject in 1777, and he pursued it until early in 1787, when Doctors White and Prevost, and in September, 1790, Dr. Madison, were consecrated in due order, by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In consequence of the victory in 1772, gained by *law and justice* over *opinion and precedent*, the slaves who had been brought from the west, together with others variously trapanned, became free. But they found themselves in a foreign land, with an uncongenial climate and amidst a crowded population, where their services were little wanted; and we cannot be surprised that their former superiors, who had oppressed or plundered, should now abandon them. The tiger from whose jaws the lamb has been rescued, thinks more of the disappointment of his own appetite than of the sufferings of the lamb. *So*, the impenitent tyrant, who is deprived of his horrible power, rages at the wholesome curb, rather than thinks of the amends which he owes to his plundered and outraged fellow-men.

About four hundred rescued slaves, most of them Africans, remained in London. Far away from their friends and relations, without employment and without legal claim for support, most of them suffered and some of them severely. To Granville Sharp, they naturally turned their eyes, and his great heart opened spontaneously to their wants; but his means were inadequate to the demand, and their provisioning became to him a subject of tender care—he called them his "orphans" and showed all a father's spirit towards them. How loathsome was the system of legalized felony still continued in the west, which thus made and kept them exiles and orphans!

There was at this time (1786) in England a benevolent and talented man named Smeatham, who had resided for

---

Note.—Morgan Godwyn, a British clergyman; John Woolman, an American Friend; and Rev. James Ramsay, should be added to the names elsewhere contained in this memoir, as most nobly instrumental in the holy cause of liberty and love.

some time in Africa, at the foot of the Sierra Leone mountains. He had been delighted with the place, and to him seems first to have occurred, in conversing with many of the rescued slaves of African blood, the idea of obtaining a settlement for them at Sierra Leone. This was communicated by several of his poor "orphan exiles" to Granville Sharp; and Sharp seems to have revolved it much in his mind, and to have been carefully engaged in maturing the requisite measure, from 1783 to 1787. Mr. Smeatham was to have conducted the infant establishment. Government had engaged to allow him £12 for each person, whatever the number, that might accompany him. Navy transports were to be provided for the service, and all the necessary arrangements were on the point of completion, when Mr. Smeatham, probably from over exertion, was seized with a sudden fever, and in three days was no more.

Sharp in a letter to his brother in January, 1788, thus speaks of the establishment: "The settlers consisted chiefly of blacks and of people of color, who had served in the army and navy,* during the late war, and having imprudently spent all their earnings, they fell into extreme poverty and were starving about the streets, till they were relieved, for some time, by a voluntary subscription of charitable people.

"In the mean time, a proposal was made to them by the late Mr. Smeatham, to form a free settlement at Sierra Leone. Many of them came to consult me about the proposal. Sometimes they came in large bodies together. Upon inquiring among themselves, I found that several of them had been on the spot; and they assured me, that there was much fine wood land unoccupied on that part of the coast. This account was confirmed to me by several other channels, and more particularly by a young negro man, a native of Sierra Leone, whom I happily saved, just at that time from slavery."

In another place, in a letter to the Archbishop of Can-

* Most of these were refugee slaves from the United States.

terbury, dated 1st August, 1786, he thus describes the settlers: "The present set of unfortunate negroes that are starving in our streets were brought here on very different occasions. Some indeed have been brought as servants, but chiefly by officers—others were royalists from America—but more are seamen, who have navigated the King's ships from the East and West Indies, or have served in the war."

In this letter to the Archbishop, Sharp earnestly recommends a Mr. Fraser, as missionary minister to accompany the expedition.

In his memoranda, dated 1st August, 1783, he says, "as the majority of the settlers will probably be *Africans* returned from slavery *to their own soil*," &c.

The plan of government which he laid down, endeavored to combine the greatest freedom, with the greatest equity, and the highest security. The community was to be divided into tens, fifties, hundreds, thousands, &c., each with a head elected by themselves, and all bound together, by the reciprocal ties of *frank pledge*. The elections were to be annual. Each individual to be answerable with his person and property, to the tithing of which he was a member, for all damages which he occasioned or which he did not do his best to prevent, the tithing to the hundred and so on: for according to *frank pledge*, no man is entitled to liberty, who is not duly pledged by his nearest neighbor, for the mutual preservation of peace and right. All crimes, except murder, rape and unnatural crimes, were to be punished *proportionably* by fine and imprisonment.

Thus devised, of these materials and upon these principles, the expedition, after some months delay caused by Mr. Smeatham's sudden death, sailed on 8th April, 1787, under the convoy of the Nautilus, sloop of war, Capt. Thompson. The number of rescued slaves was upwards of four hundred, and besides these, were about sixty Europeans.

The place appropriated for their use was purchased from King Tom, a neighboring chief, and is thus described in the first annual report, 1791:

"The district purchased for the settlement at Sierra Leone, is nearly twice as large as the island of Barbadoes,

being 20 miles square, containing 256,000 acres of land, well watered with salubrious springs, and situated on a fruitful peninsula, between two noble navigable rivers; the great river of Sierra Leone and the Sherbro', which receives the waters of many others. The peninsula rises into hills, forming upon one another into lofty mountains, the sides and summits of which are covered with timber.

"The extraordinary temper and salubrity of the air for European constitutions in this peculiar spot of the torrid zone, has been remarked by ancient writers and by modern travelers of respectability. The river has a safe channel for ships of any burthen; and St. George's bay, the first approach to the new settlement, is perhaps the finest harbor in the world.

"Sierra Leone is about 8° 12′ N. latitude and 12° W. L. It is generally about a month's sail from England; but more in returning, on account of the interruption of the trade winds."

In another part of this report we read:

"Mr. Falconbridge has collected several specimens of native produce, particularly of woods, iron ore, gum copal, pepper, rice, cotton and sugar cane, which afford the most favorable hopes.

"All the most valuable productions of the tropical climates, seem to grow spontaneously at Sierra Leone; and nothing but attention and cultivation appear wanting, in order to produce them of every kind, and in sufficient quantities to become articles of trade, and even of great national concern."

Granville Sharp says in a letter dated 31st October, 1787: "They have purchased twenty miles square of the finest and most beautiful country (they all allow) that was ever seen. The hills are not steeper than Shooter's hill; and fine streams of fresh waters, run down the hill, on each side of the new township; and in the front is a noble bay, where the river is about three leagues wide. The woods and groves are beautiful beyond description, and the soil very fine." Sir George Young, of the navy, assured him that this view of the place was correct.

But in these pictures, there is a deception. As it imposed

upon that day, in relation to Sierra Leone, so has it imposed upon ours, in relation to Cape Mesurado, and still more recently, to Cape Palmas. The deception is natural, though big with death. Enterprise and hope are elate in the human mind: the heart in such a frame is prepared for dreams of Eden. The beauty of the scenery; the richness and constant verdure of the trees; the deliciousness of the fruits; the coolness of the morning; the soul reviving freshness of the sea breeze; the almost unearthly sweetness of evening as it comes down, solemn, temperate, peaceful, a paradise refuge from the burning day; excite even in ordinary minds, almost the poet's rapture; and Sierra Leone, Cape Mesurado, Cape Palmas, are painted under the extasy. The mountains too, the glorious mountains! tall, clad with undying green; murmuring with streams; varying into ten thousand forms, as the shadows of the gorgeous clouds rest on them or pass away: yes, the mountains, the brothers of the thunder, the cradle of the winds; the clifted, valleyed, verdant, placid, fountained mountains, with an atmosphere of double death, are dreamt into salubrity, and the elated imagination feasts on the idea of the health which must be found amidst their shades.

The traversers of the *Ghauts* know other things of these glorious mountains—and yet with the impression deep in my memory of the wail of anguish and of death from my perishing companions, and of the fever that came upon myself like a whirlwind and all but thrust me into an early eternity, my heart can scarcely break through the delusion of their glorious beauty, and often pants in its dreamings, again to wander as I have done amidst their cliffs and their glens while the thunders bounded from rock to rock, and the lightnings spread around me a blazing sea, and the large, quick tears of heaven fell gushing over a guilty world.

The simple facts of this matter are as follows. Decaying vegetation and all stagnant moisture, under a certain temperature, with confined circulation, (say from 70° upwards) generate, *wherever they are found together*, an atmosphere of death: and the intensity of this *malaria*, is in

proportion to the excess of the ingredients which produce it, viz. *decaying vegetation, stagnant moisture, a high temperature,* and *a confined circulation.* The mountains in warm climates are most destructive, *because* they have the largest proportion of *these united ingredients,* always excepting, where they rise to the temperate region, that is five or six thousand feet above the level of the sea.

It is this fact, which causes such mournful waste of life in the new settlements in the United States and in south western Canada, and the settlers therefore cannot be too diligent, in removing all decaying vegetation, and all stagnant moisture as far as possible from their vicinities, *before* the heats of autumn.

But Sierra Leone is in fact a glorious spot—glorious in beauty, moderately fertile—with one of the finest harbors in the world; replete with the grandeur and beauty of the tropics; and ready to become salubrious, as soon as the causes of death can be removed. The labors and sufferings of a few more generations will probably effect this.

The long detention in the channel, to which the settlers were exposed, induced great sickness amongst them, and threw their landing at Sierra Leone into the rainy or sickly season. Intemperance amongst themselves, vastly aggravated the evil; and their numbers were reduced in consequence by death almost one half, in the course of the first year. A few deserted.

The remnant built a small town, and after the period above mentioned suffered no extraordinary mortality. They gradually improved in their circumstances, "and though far from being regularly industrious, were able to supply themselves with a sufficiency of food, and to secure a small, but constantly increasing property." Many, however, continued to migrate, and at one time, the community was in danger of extinction.

During this period, Granville Sharp, watchful over his orphan settlement with a father's care, had despatched on 7th May, 1798, a small vessel called the Myro, with some additional settlers and she arrived most opportunely to prevent utter despair and dispersion. On this occasion,

the original purchase, was confirmed by Naimbana, a superior native chieftain, who resided between the English slave factory at Bunce Island and the French one at Gambia, upon the small island of Rohanna.

Towards the close of the next year (1789) a new disaster overwhelmed the establishment. The brief history of this is so characteristic of the mode which governments take to repair injuries; and of the fact so disgraceful to *civilized* people, that they are generally the first *aggressors*, that it deserves a detail.

An American slave captain had carried off two subjects of King Tom, the native chief residing within half a mile of the English settlement. Tom watched for retaliation. An American boat from another ship passing up the river gave him the opportunity—he attacked and plundered it; putting the crew of three or four men to death, excepting one who made his escape to the slave factory, to which the boat was going. At this time, a British ship of war was lying in the river, and the agent of the factory consulting with the officers, determined upon revenge. They first endeavored to decoy Tom on board; but he knew them too well. They then with a force of sailors and marines, attacked his town, plundered and burnt it. The slave factor soon after left the coast, and the neighboring chiefs holding a council, and finding that two of the settlers of Sierra Leone had aided their enemies, determined upon destroying the settlement. They proceeded legally and deliberately, just as more enlightened people do. A formal notice was solemnly sent of their dreadful purpose to Sierra Leone, and three days were allowed the inhabitants for removal. The settlers had no alternative. They fled; and the judicial sentence was carried into execution at the appointed time.

Meanwhile Sharp finding the inadequacy of his own resources, had been endeavoring to form an incorporated company, and to secure the aid of Government in conducting the enterprise. And the company, united and animated by his influence, was induced by the emergency just mentioned, to expedite their measures, even before they had

received the charter, which they were given to expect. Mr. Falconbridge was sent out with the requisite powers and supplies, in September, 1790. Immediately after his arrival, he collected as many as he could of the dispersed people, and settled them about two miles further than before from King Tom, where they found some deserted huts, and where they immediately began to clear and plant land. The new settlement was called *Granvilletown*, and the number of people gathered together in it were altogether sixty-four.

Soon after this, the Charter of Incorporation was obtained, and a considerable capital raised for carrying on the commerce of the settlement. The utmost watchfulness continued to be exhibited by all the authorities against the slave trade. The face of things became cheerful.

An opportunity about this time occurred of greatly increasing the settlement.

During the American revolutionary war, a considerable number of refugee slaves, had found their way to the British camps and vessels, and had been enlisted into the King's service. At the end of the war they were carried to Nova Scotia and promised land—but this promise was not faithfully kept, and the bleak climate disagreed with them. They were now willing to remove to Sierra Leone, and the requisite measures were promptly taken.

But preparations from England were necessary for their accomodation, and three vessels were accordingly expedited early in 1792, with upwards of one hundred Europeans. Soon after these reached Sierra Leone, the Nova Scotian fleet arrived, consisting of sixteen vessels, with eleven hundred and thirty-one settlers, after having lost sixty-five on the passage.

The original site of the town was now resumed. The former purchase was now secured by a new *Palaver*, and by new presents, and the appropriate name of *Freetown*, which it still retains, was given it.

Another ship meanwhile, of great burthen, (850 tons) was chartered, for the purpose of hastening to the settlers every accommodation which could be secured to them,

before the sickly season—but she was driven back by a storm, and did not reach them till after great delays. The Nova Scotians also, *refugees from slavery; exiles from home; late tenants of the camp and the navy; deceived in the promises formerly made them*, and *disheartened* by *change* and *uncertainty*, did not exert themselves as they might have done, and the sickly season came upon them unprepared. The rains began about the third week in May. A high degree of health had previously inspired a rash and ignorant confidence. The sickness which ensued was most severe. All the medical persons except one, were laid up. The storekeepers were amongst the first victims. Disorder arose in every department, and despondency almost universally prevailed. Nearly one half of the Europeans residing on shore, were carried off, and about one-tenth of the Nova Scotians.

About the 9th October, the rains had ceased, and by the end of that month, two meeting houses and a school house, were completed. The frames for these, were sent from England. The government, before this, had been modified to suit the new authorities placed over them, Granville Sharp being one of the new Directors. A garden of experiment was established, under Dr. Afzelius, an eminent botanist, and two plantations were begun by the company, as an example to others; both worked by free laborers—one of these was soon relinquished. The settlement continued generally to flourish, until towards the close of 1794, when it was almost entirely destroyed by a predatory French squadron, piloted by an American slave captain. The French landed on 28th Sept., and kept possession until 13th Oct., plundering and destroying without pity.

Several years before this, a Danish slaver having anchored in the bay, the slaves rose, mastered the crew, landed and resorting to the neighboring mountains, built a village, which was called "*Deserter's Town.*" In this they dwelt in peace, but exercising the utmost vigilance to avoid all intercourse with strangers. During the distress above mentioned, they cast off, however, their caution, and most affectionately received and entertained several of the

English settlers, who fled to them for safety—and yet, *white* men, and *free* men, and *christians*, must keep *such* people slaves!!!! The *black* chief of a neighboring town, sheltered and protected the mistress with the children of the public school, from the white French! The loss of property was estimated at about $250,000. Sickness, from exposure, fatigue, want of shelter, accommodation, medicine, &c., followed and carried off, many of the poorer Europeans. But the extremity of the affliction, was blessed to the awakening among the settlers, of an humbler mind, and for some time, they evinced a greater extent of docility, industry and enterprise, than they had previously exhibited. The next four years, were years of prosperity.

The village of the generous refugees above mentioned, was called as I have stated, "*Deserter's Town.*" Thus do civilized people, *often* the most *barbarian* of all, apply their *own* terms of reproach, to people less barbarous than they. Who *were* the *barbarians* in the case above? The Danes or the Africans? Yet the Danes, and the English, and the Americans, were *honorable* merchants! engaged in a lucrative trade, sanctioned by *enlightened* governments! But when a few of their victims, escaped providentially from their floating vehicles of despotism and of death, fly to unappropriated mountains and apply themselves peaceably to their own support, they are called "*deserters.*" How *honorable, indeed,* the title, in such a connection!! and how ought our souls to bless the Lord, that they were not in the West Indies or the United States, since *there*, they would have been called "*runaways,*" and all the tiger in the heart of the white man, would have been called into action to pursue them to bondage or to death.* Alas! if *color* could disgrace a people, how deep in the nethermost regions of shame, would that color be, which is called *white* in the United States; frequently with such utter recklessness of truth. White! Why, it is brown, sallow and yellow, as well as pale and ruddy; and frequently will you hear a man, decidedly the darkest and the least manly of

* Trelawney hunt, in the Appendix, No. II.

the two, turn up his colored nose at the other, because he is colored too: or if, as is sometimes the case, the nose of scorn alone is colored, and the sufferer is evidently white, *then*, the conviction of *one drop* of African blood mingling with the *European streams* in his veins, or the fearful fact, *that the mother to whom God gave him, was a slave!!* sanctions his degradation, and the colored nose curls higher still, distended with magnanimous superiority! So, worse than barbarian, can *civilization* be! So, deeper in the guilt of *caste*, can men called *christians*, plunge themselves, than even the Hindoos do! How glorious is the fact, that we have another standard. "Bless the Lord, oh my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name," that His word stands sure forever; that we read in *a record* against which earth and hell united, cannot prevail, "that, he who loveth God, should love his brother also;" 1 John iv. 21; and again, "he that loveth not his brother abideth in death;" 1 John, iii. 14. What! a *christian*, and a despiser of his brother, because he does not come up to the petty standard of national prejudice and pride. What—a christian, and a keeper back, by force or fraud, of the laborers wages!! A christian, and an oppressor. A christian, and exercising oppression!! A christian, and yet robbing the poor, *because* he is poor; robbing him of his *liberty*, his *time*, his *labor*, his *safety*, his *right* to the *Bible* and to the *unfettered* preaching of the cross of Christ!! to the cultivation of his own mind, and the freedom of his own choice!!

Must not *such* christianity be, indeed, the "loudest laugh of hell." What can strengthen infidelity so much, as calling *such a thing*, christianity! What upright mind could exist, which would not forever prefer infidelity to *such* christianity! What could satan desire more, for the perdition of this world, than that the world should be filled with *such christians*. Men to men, "as wolves, for rapine—as the fox, for wiles—pursuing and pursued, each others prey," each seeking every opportunity, and grasping every excuse to lord it over his brother. Oh, how different was the life of Him, who went about doing good—"who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister"—

and who has left us an example, that we should "follow his steps." How different—blessed be the Lord forever! are the more than seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal, the christians, *indeed;* the *philanthropists*, not the white color idolaters of the United States. Not the amalgamators, who by cherishing or exercising slavery, are supporting in the slave states, almost universal amalgamation, by incest, adultery and fornication; but the friends of rightful liberty, who would have the whole land, without respect of persons, immediately and thoroughly delivered (through the slave-masters, themselves, then no longer slave-masters, enacting just and benignant laws) from the atrocious system of forced servitude, which, leaving the wretched female slave, no choice or *refuge*, is filling the land with all these abominations.

Between 1798 and 1800, much and dangerous discontent was increasingly fomented amongst the Nova Scotian settlers, by a few evil minds, and in the latter end of September, 1800, it had reached a portentous height, when it was suddenly arrested by one of those gracious providences of God, which strike with gratitude, even man's dull heart.

A large ship suddenly appeared in the bay—on board of her, were 550 Maroons, exiled from Jamaica, together with 45 soldiers under two officers. These, at once, took the side of the government, and the malcontents, after a shew of resistance, and after having two men killed, submitted. The Maroons were settled in Granvilletown, in November, 1800. They built it up with neatness, and began to cultivate their land with spirit. Native free laborers worked for hire amongst them with alacrity.

The government and protection of the settlement, was assumed on 1st Jan., 1808, by the King, with parliamentary sanction, in consequence of a petition to that purpose from the Company; and the Directors retired from power, rejoicing in the extent to which they had vindicated the African character, from the slander of its oppressors, and the European character from the stain of its crimes. They exulted also, in the hope, that they had contributed materially to sweep the slave trade from the African coast. But in

this, they overlooked the fact, as so many less excusably still do, that the extinction of the *demand* for *any* commodity alone can put an end to its *supply ;* that *slavery* must cease, before the *slave trade* can be abolished. Witness the United States, and "par eminence," the District of Columbia.*

At this period, 1807—8, the settlement was flourishing in agriculture, commerce, education and health. The population amounted to 1871. Here the history of Granville Sharp, becomes disconnected with its subsequent progress, and we therefore take leave of it with the following anecdote.

In 1791, King Naimbana, filled with admiration for Sharp's character, sent his eldest son to England for education, committing him to Sharp's care ; and the young chief was soon settled about forty miles from London, *in the family of Rev. Mr. Gambier.* Sharp, though thus at a distance, watched over him like a father ; and young Naimbana (then twenty-nine years of age,) exhibited a dispo-

---

* It is well ascertained (though not *legally* established) that 3,000 new Africans or upwards, are imported annually through Texas, (across the Sabine) into Louisiana, &c., *feloniously,* according to the *United States* law—and it is believed, on *grounds* apparently valid, that 50,000 native American citizens, some of them whiter than their masters, (and this class of orthodox color is continually increasing,) are annually bought and sold like beasts, in the states south of Pennsylvania, *feloniously* according to *God's law.* Let every man judge which is the greatest felony! Of this *internal slave trade, the city of Washington is the metropolis!*

Should any one here observe, that Sierra Leone became eventually a warrior colony, with its forts and its guns—and that it put on this character, even before its connexion with Granville Sharp was dissolved, I admit and deplore the fact. The change was unworthy of the glorious foundation on which it rose. Such was also the eventual result in Pennsylvania, that *brother* settlement! But the change did not take place in Sierra Leone, till Granville Sharp ceased to preside over it ; and he seems to have remained connected with it, not as approving of the change, but merely as he remained chairman of the Society for the Abolition of the African slave trade, although he abhorred the principle which induced them to confine their efforts to the branch, instead of striking, at once, at the root. He did not feel himself at liberty to depart from an object *noble in itself,* because abuses crept into it ; and this must be the conduct of every sane mind ; the only danger, in this respect, being, *that* of mistaking things *ignoble in themselves,* like the colonization pursuit of the United States, for things *really* and altogether noble, such as Sierra Leone was in its foundation.

sition in every way worthy of cultivation. His capacity was not extraordinary; but he excelled in distinguishing characters. His person was not remarkable; but his demeanor was uncommonly pleasing, being full of native courtesy and delicacy. His disposition was affectionate and his feelings warm. He became deeply impressed with religious principles, and with reverence for the sacred scriptures. His morals were pure, and he always shewed a strong abhorrence for profane conversation, and for every kind of vice. Respecting the reputation of his country, he displayed a lively jealousy; and being once told of a person who had publicly asserted something highly derogatory to the African character, he broke out into violent and vindictive language. Being immediately reminded of the duty of loving our enemies, he replied, "If a man should rob me of my money, I could forgive him; if he should shoot at me, or try to stab me, I could forgive him. If he should sell me and all my family into slavery, I could forgive him; but," added he, rising from his seat with great emotion; "if a man takes away the character of the people of my country, I cannot forgive him." Why, said his friend. He answered, solemnly, "If a man steal from me, or try to kill me, or sell me and my family for slaves, he does an injury to the *few*, whom he attacks or sells. But *if any one take away the character of black people, he injures black people all over the world;* and when once he has taken away their character, there is nothing which he may not afterwards do to black people. He will beat black men, and say, 'Oh, it is only *a black man!*' He will enslave black people, and cry, 'Oh, they are *blacks!*' He may take away all the people of Africa, if he can catch them, and if you ask him, 'Why do you take away all these people,' he will say, 'Oh, they are only black people—they are not as white as we are—why should I not take them?' *That* is the reason why I cannot forgive the man, who takes away the character of the people of my country.—(See Appendix 3.)

What an awful exhibition of the truth of this foresight, does the present *colonization-mind* of the United States exhibit. How would young Naimbana's heart be wrung

could he now traverse this land, and mark the people who commit, or excuse, all tyrannical, and proud, incestuous, and adulterous, and libidinous intercourse with them, through a system which leaves them no choice and makes them the wretched sufferers of all their oppressor's horrible pleasures and at the same time, cry out, with *horror*, against immediately setting them free. "Yes—he is a black man"—or "he has one drop of African blood in his veins"—or "his poor mother was violated and enslaved before him" is confirmation, "strong as proof of holy writ," in this land *now*, against all virtuous brotherhood for Naimbana's color; and the man, who will not join the general lie, is deemed a madman—Oh, the glorious madness—the land is leavening with it—and the leaven is working. Yea, blessed be God—the heart of the United States is not dead forever—its prejudices, though in this respect the most brutal on earth, are vincible. Its religion, and liberty, and manhood are reviving and are going to be vindicated in peace, by God's all conquering weapons of truth and love; and from the Gulph of Mexico to Canada; and from the Atlantic to the western prairies, one universal shout is preparing to ascend, without respect of persons, or of colors, of "Glory to God in the highest—and of peace, good will, to men;" to men, *because they are men and Americans*—and *not* because they are not of a color, which above all others, in modern times, has disgraced itself before God and the world;—*to men*, because they are the guiltless sufferers of wrong; no longer limiting its respect and its brotherhood, to the *guilty!*

During the course of these events, an important effort was organizing against the African slave trade—and could a tree be destroyed by lopping off a branch; or, a fountain be dried up by separating one of its streams, slavery would ere this have received its death blow, and the friends of man obtained this sacred desire of their hearts.

In the spring of 1787, a meeting was held in London, at the house of Bennet Langton, Esq.; present, Sir Charles Middleton, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Hawkins Brown, Sir

Joshua Reynolds, and two others, who afterwards proved enemies. At this meeting, Mr. Wilberforce was solicited, and engaged to take the lead in Parliament, but soon after falling sick, Mr. Pitt took his place till his recovery. On 22d of May, a committee of twelve was chosen and Granville Sharp was named as one of the committee.*

This committee immediately dispersed *circulars*, giving an account of their organization and object. The *Friends* as a body responded to the notice, with alacrity—the *General Baptists* declared their concurrence ; and a correspondence was opened with the societies established in New-York and Philadelphia, for the manumission of slaves, and the abolition of slavery. Mr. Clarkson's "Summary View of the Slave Trade, and of the probable consequences of its Abolition," were extensively scattered, and truth, thus placed before them, took more and more hold on the best minds in the nation. The Rev. John Wesley and Dr. Price gave their important aid. Robert Baucher Nicholls, Dean of Middleham, prepared a letter, which was printed by the committee and widely circulated. Dr. Watson, Bishop of Landaff, added his support. Public attention was aroused—meetings began to be numerously called—knowledge was multiplied—petitions poured in, and the Government found itself under a necessity of paying attention to the noble public sentiment which was rapidly forming against the long cherished iniquity of the nation.

In 1788, Lafayette was enrolled, at his own request, amongst the honorary and corresponding members of the society. John Jay and Benjamin Franklin added their honored names.

An ex-jesuit, called Harris, a clerk in a slave-trading house in Liverpool, endeavored to support the iniquitious

* It is pleasing here to record, that eleven years previously, (in 1776) Mr. David Hartley member of the Commons for Hull, had brought forward a motion, "That the slave trade is contrary to the laws of God and to the rights of men," and that Sir George Saville, had seconded it. But it is equally painful to record, that the British Parliament at that time, had a heart in this respect, altogether alien to God and its brother.

system by "Scriptural Researches on the licitness of the Slave Trade." I mention the fact, merely that similar men now, may know who their forefathers in spirit, were.

In May, 1788, Mr. Pitt asked the Parliament to pledge itself to a full discussion of the subject next session.

In the spring of 1789, Mr. Wilberforce introduced his motion; but the slave faction got the question postponed.

A section of a slave ship meanwhile with the slaves stowed away in it, was published and thrilled through the public mind. The most interesting communications were had with Paris.

Early in 1790, Wilberforce renewed his motion—and again was met with delays. The combination against his holy cause, was mighty; and the most false and fierce alarms were industriously fancied or fabricated to impede it. "Civil war"—"ruin and bloodshed to the colonies"—"destruction to the masters, and wretchedness tenfold worse than slavery!!! to the slaves"—"anarchy—sterility—famine," were portended as the infallible consequences of "ceasing to do evil and learning to do well"—of putting an end by law to a system which is now condemned as "PIRACY" and which was then as feloniously piratical as it is now; the only difference being, that British law, *now* speaks the truth respecting it—and *then* with brazen wickedness supported falsehood.

In April, 1791, Wilberforce moved for leave to bring in "A Bill to prevent the further importation of Slaves into the British Colonies in the West Indies." But the motion was rejected by a majority. This defeat however only stimulated the zeal of the friends of humanity. An abridgement of all the evidence which had been obtained, was profusely circulated. The invaluable Thomas Clarkson, like a messenger of light, traversed the nation, and the public mind stirred itself up in behalf of holy love and liberty. Three hundred thousand persons at this period, refrained from sugar altogether; perceiving that by using it, they were directly supporting the slave system which they abhorred. Three hundred and ten petitions were presented from England; one hundred and eighty-seven from Scot-

land; and twenty from Wales. Free labor sugar could not then be had in England.

Here I cannot feel myself absolved from the duty of offering a few lines on the subject of abstaining from *slave produce*. The question relates, *not to domestic*, but to *agricultural slavery:* and the slavery here meant, is "*the forced servitude of the guiltless poor.*" Be it also remembered, that the producc spoken of, is "*produce, poisoned* (*morally* poisoned) by the *unrequited toil*, and the *unpitied anguish* of the plundered and outraged poor. Whenever I see people, especially if they in other respects be anti-slavery men, enjoying this destructive material, I am forcibly reminded of the fable of "*the boys and the frogs.*" "It is pleasure to you; but death to us."

Why do slave masters keep slaves? To get labor out of them—and to get money by their labor—and to gratify their affections and appetites by money. They keep slaves to please themselves and to pamper their families—God and their neighbor, in this relation, are as nought to them.

Why do people use slave produce? To please themselves and their company! The cry of the laborer, whose wages are kept back by fraud and force, has gone up to God against it. It has been watered with his sweat—his blood, gushing from the frequent lash, has manured it; the curse of his iniquitous bondage is upon it; for it, he has been deprived of wife, and child, and sacred home; of time and liberty; of body and of mind—*all*—*all* being his master's—yet, this *deeply poisoned produce*, people use, because they like it. Excellent reason to produce at the bar of God!! How will it differ from the slave master's?

Who gives to the slave master the money, which is his sole motive for keeping slaves? The consumers of the produce of forced and unrequited toil.

What is the main source and support of slavery? The demand for the products of its labor.

Would the supply be continued, if the demand ceased? Certainly not.

Would slave masters keep slaves, if they could not sell the products of their labor? Certainly not.

Who create and support this demand? The consumers of slave produce.

What then are slave masters? Merely mercenaries, who when tempted or hired by the consumer, conduct or do the dreadful work, which must be done, before the consumer, the tempter, can be gratified.

Is it not, I would solemnly say to every reader of these lines, as criminal to hire or support slavery, as it is directly to perpetrate it? Or, if the slave master be found guilty at the judgment seat, can *they* escape, who *voluntarily* give him the sole motive for becoming or continuing a slave master? Consumers of slave produce, look well to it. You will want a good answer at the bar of God! And remember, that to darken truth, or to render duty obscure, by excuses which art can frame, or which corruption admits, is eternally a different thing from any thing that God can approve of.

SECTION IV.

On 2d of April, 1792, Mr. Wilberforce moved "that the trade carried on by British subjects, for the purpose of obtaining slaves on the coast of Africa, ought to be abolished." The discussion which ensued, was deeply interesting, and some progress was made. Mr. H. Thornton, chairman of the Sierra Leone company, said in the course of it, speaking of the slave trade, "It had obtained the name of *a trade*, and many had been deceived by the appellation: but it was *a war*, not *a trade;* it was a *mass of crimes*, and not *commerce;* it alone prevented the introduction of *trade* into Africa. * * * * It created more embarrassments than all the natural impediments of the country, and was more hard to contend with, than any difficulties of climate, soil, or natural dispositions of the people." Such is still the case; and such must continue to be the case, until slavery, its sole parent and support, is abolished.

In 1793, Mr. Wilberforce renewed and lost his motion.

In 1794, he renewed and carried it at last, through the House of Commons, but the Lords rejected it.

In 1795—6, the effort was renewed and negatived.

In 1797, an address was carried to the king.

In 1798—9, Mr. Wilberforce renewed his motion and was defeated: but in the last of these years Dr. Horsley, Bishop of Rochester, in the house of Lords, nobly and effectually vindicated scripture from the blasphemous imputation of tolerating slavery.

From this period, until 1804, Mr. Wilberforce thought it best not to renew his motion, leaving the excitement which had been awakened, to work, and supplying it continually with fresh fuel, by means of truth more and more largely and diligently diffused.

In 1804, the bill passed the Commons, but its discussion in the Lords was deferred till next season.

In 1805, Wilberforce renewed his motion, but lost it. Mr. Pitt, who had thus far fostered the bill, soon after died.

In 1806, the bill was committed to Sir Arthur Piggott, the Attorney General; and being introduced by him, passed both houses. Mr. Fox then moved (10th June) "That the House, considering the slave trade to be contrary to the principles of justice, humanity and policy, will, with all practicable expedition, take effectual measures for its abolition." This was carried by a majority of 114 to 15 in the Commons; and of 41 to 20 in the Lords. Mr. Fox died before the next session.

In 1807, Lord Granville brought into the House of Lords, "A bill for the Abolition of the Slave Trade." Counsel was heard against the bill for four days. The subject was then thoroughly discussed—and the bill passed with a majority of 100 to 36. In the Commons the majority in its favor was 283 against 16. It passed the Commons on 10th February, 1807.

A committee of the whole House being then formed, a bill was immediately passed, "that no vessel should clear out for slaves, from any port within the British dominions, after 1st May, 1807;" and "that no slave should be landed

in the Colonies after 1st March, 1808." This bill was passed on 16th March, 1807, and through the strenuous exertions of Lord Granville, received the royal assent on Wednesday, 25th, a few minutes only before the ministers resigned their respective offices, as they had been required to do, by a message delivered to them that morning.

So, fell the *legality* of the *African slave trade*. God was gracious to his servants as far as they were faithful to his cause. They struck at the branch, and were enabled to fell it—but the root remained uninjured by the wound. They attacked an *effect;* but left the *great cause* untouched. They cut off a stream; but left the fountain still to pour forth floods of guilt and misery.

It refreshes my soul to find, that Granville Sharp, partook not of this unfaithfulness. Contemplating the depth and *almost death* in sin, of the national mind, the others solemnly deliberated, whether they should attack the whole evil, or only a part of it; for it does not seem, that they saw so clearly, as we now cannot help seeing, that the slave trade was merely a branch of slavery—they saw that it was a *similar* evil—but they do not seem to have seen, that it was *an effect* of *another evil;* and that *slavery*, its cause, must be abolished before it could cease. But they shrunk from attacking, at once, the *united force* of the slave holder and of the slave dealer, and chose the latter as being most vincible. Granville Sharp, on the contrary, questioned not the power of his enemies—he regarded not the fewness of his friends—he did not stumble at his own unworthiness. He saw his country's guilt and danger; and he did not dare to mete it out, as the favor or fear of man dictated. He heard the voice of heaven calling him up to the *whole conflict*, and he solemnly and vehemently remonstrated with the committee against the resolution which they had adopted declaring, that "as *slavery* was as much a crime against the Divine law, as the *slave trade*, it became the committee to exert themselves equally against the continuance of both; and he did not hesitate to pronounce all present, *guilty before God*, for shutting those, who were then slaves, out of the pale of their approaching

labors." He delivered this protest, with a loud voice, a powerful emphasis, and both hands lifted up towards heaven, as was usual to him, when much moved. The committee acknowledged the criminality of *both*, to be the same—but they adhered to their resolution; fearing, that if they attacked at once, both slavery and the slave trade, they would succeed against neither. Granville Sharp, though wounded to the quick by this decision in some of his most sacred feelings, perceived that the burthen rested with him no longer, his testimony having been faithfully borne; and he continued to labor with cordial zeal, in the cause which his friends were pursuing. His office in the committee, was chairman, by a unanimous vote of the members, as "Father," in their language, "of the cause in England." But while he sustained the responsibility, and performed the duty of the office, he would never assume the chair. Thomas Clarkson says of him, "I have attended above seven hundred committees and sub-committees with him, and yet, though sometimes but few were present, he always seated himself at the end of the room; choosing rather to serve the glorious cause, in humility through conscience, than in the character of a distinguished individual." He had well learnt and steadily practiced the glorious injunction, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Matt. xx. 26, 27.

Sharp's extensive and intimate acquaintance and correspondence with the noblest minds of the day, was of essential service to the cause. He seems to have been particularly useful amongst the ministers of the established church. He was the first who instructed Mr. Pitt upon the subject, Pitt having sent for him in consequence of Mr. Wilberforce's illness. Not long after, Thomas Clarkson had an interview with Pitt, and Pitt expressed his doubts as to the reality of the treatment of the slaves, as well as to the mortality of the seamen; and also, as to the riches, genius and abilities of the African people. Clarkson was desired to wait upon him the following day, with such proofs as he could bring. "At the time appointed," says Clarkson, "I

went, with my books, papers, and African productions. Mr. Pitt examined them himself. He turned over leaf after leaf, in which the copies of the muster rolls were contained, with great patience, and when he had looked over above a hundred pages accurately, and found the name of every seaman inserted—his former abode or service—the time of his entry—and what had become of him, either by death, discharge, or desertion—he confessed with some emotion, that his doubts were wholly removed, with respect to the destructive nature of the employ ; and he said, that the facts contained in these documents if they had been but fairly copied, could never be disproved.

"He was equally astonished at the various woods, and other productions of Africa ; but most of all, at the manufactures of the natives, in cotton, leather, gold and iron, which were laid before him. These, he handled and examined over and over again. On the sight of these, many sublime thoughts seemed to rush in upon him at once ; some of which he expressed, with observations becoming a great and dignified mind." Granville Sharp's notes declare the same conviction of Mr. Pitt's magnanimity and integrity in this holy cause.

But though Sharp, as chairman and member of the committee of the society for abolishing the African slave trade, confined himself to that particular and limited object, he did not merge therein his personal and separate identity, or forsake the nobler yearnings of his soul. Alive to the cause of universal philanthropy, he seized every opportunity of urging the sacred cause of the slave ; and of asserting the principle dear to his heart, which the British code and everlasting law alike establish, "that it is better to suffer every evil, than to consent to any," Melius est omnia mala pati, quam malo consentire. In a letter to the Bishop of London, of January, 1795, he earnestly warns him, "of the great national danger, of tolerating slavery in any part of the British dominions," and urges the scriptural doctrines, that "the throne is established by righteousness," and that no power can be durably established without it. In a memorandum, (without date) the follow-

ing is the breathing of his upright soul: "Having been required by the committee of the society in London, instituted for effecting the abolition of the slave trade, to sign officially and singly with my name their late resolutions, in answer to the charges of —— —— Esq.; I think it right to declare, with respect to *myself individually*, that though I have carefully maintained the principles and orders of the society, in every transaction, wherein I have been concerned as a member of it, ever since it was formed in 1787, and have always strictly limited my *official* endeavors to the single declared object of the institution, '*the abolition of the slave trade.*' Yet I am bound in reason and common justice to mankind, further to declare, that many years (at least twenty) before the society was formed, I thought, and ever shall think it my duty to expose the *monstrous impiety and cruelty* (*impious* and *cruel*, being the due epithets fixed by an allowed maxim of the law on such iniquity) not only of the slave trade, but also, of *slavery itself*, in *whatever form it is favored;* and likewise to assert, *that no authority on earth can ever render such enormous iniquities legal;* but that the Divine retribution (*the* '*measure for measure,*' so clearly denounced in the holy scriptures) will inevitably pursue every government or legislature, that shall presume to establish, or even to tolerate, such abominable injustice. I should forfeit all title to true loyalty as an Englisman, did I not continue the same fixed detestation of slavery, which I have publicly avowed for about thirty years past. But my declarations on that head, were always intended as *friendly warnings* against the *obvious and ordinary consequences* of that *unchristian oppression, slavery!* but surely, *not to excite* those *fatal consequences*—for that would be superfluous, as they are in themselves but too sure and inevitable, unless timely amendment should avert them."

But Granville Sharp's attention was not *confined* to the sacred objects which we have been considering. *They* indeed occupied his chief attention, for they *most* needed it. Fashion, honor, religious profession advocated them not. They were amongst *the poor* and *the despised things* of this

world, and needed *that unworldly love*, of which our blessed Lord has set us so glorious an example. *Those persons* therefore alone, engaged in *these* with ardor, in whose bosoms burnt the same unearthly and impartial flame. Of minds of this stamp, Granville Sharp was the first; but he cordially united in every other "labor of love."

He was a liberal subscriber to the Naval and Military Bible Society which was formed in 1780. He presided on 2d May, 1804, at the meeting in London, from which the *British and Foreign Bible Society* took its rise, and is thus mentioned in Mr. Owen's history: "In Granville Sharp, the cause obtained a temporary patron, in whom the members of the establishment acknowledged a true churchman, and real christians of every denomination, a friend and a brother. Perhaps it would not have been possible to find, a man in whom the qualities requisite for the first chairman of the British and Foreign Bible Society, were so completely united, as they were in this venerable philanthropist. A churchman in faith, and universal in charity, he stamped upon the institution, while it was yet tender, those characters which suited its constitution and its end; and while he made it respected by the sanction of his name, he improved it by the influence of his example."

Within a month after the *legal* abolition of the *African* slave trade, a new society was formed (April, 1807) called "*The African Institution.*" Prior to this it had been well ascertained through the settlement of Sierra Leone, that *agriculture*, *commerce* and *freedom*, might be introduced into Africa: it had been shown, that all the various natural products, brought from the West Indies, might be raised on the African soil; that the native chiefs might be made to perceive the full interests of peaceful communication; and that Africans in a state of freedom, might be habituated to labor in the fields, and *were capable of being governed by mild laws*, without *whips*, *tortures* or *chains* to enforce civil obedience. Even in the cases of insubordination, which had appeared among the settlers, their conduct, when compared with that of European colonists, was highly advantageous to the African character."

Before the settlement of Sierra Leone, Africa knew nothing of Europe, but her crimes. It would have been against all the evidence of which they were masters for Africans to believe that Europeans were then honest men. When charged with some enormous delinquency, "What! do you think me a white man?" was their natural and reasonable exclamation! Of this, an affecting instance is recorded by Admiral Mather Buckle, who commanded for some time, a small squadron, off the African coast. One day, while he was at anchor, an African came off in his canoe, loaded with fruits, &c. The African hailed, and cried "*What ship this?*" The other replied, imitating his jargon, "King George ship—man-of-war ship." The suspicions of the African was awakened, and he retorted, "No—you Bristol ship;" (Bristol was a port infamous for slave trading.) Admiral Buckle calmly repeated what he had said before. The poor African could no longer control his fears. "You be," he screamed, "you Bristol ship," plunged into the sea, and left his canoe to its fate. Admiral Buckle conduced to shew the Africans that there were Europeans of a different stamp from "the Bristol or slave party men," by sending the canoe carefully and kindly on shore.

The object of the African Institution, was, "To improve the temporal condition and the moral faculties of the natives of Africa; to diffuse knowledge and excite industry, by methods adapted to the peculiar situation and manners of the inhabitants; to watch over their execution of the laws which have been passed by this and other countries, for abolishing the African slave trade; and finally, to introduce the blessings of civilized society, among a people sunk in ignorance and barbarism, and occupying no less than a fourth part of the habitable globe." For these purposes, "it proposed no purchase of territory—no commercial speculation—no colonial settlement—no religious mission; but to collect and diffuse information concerning the natural productions of the country; its agricultural and commercial capacities; and the condition, as well intellectual as political, of its inhabitants. To introduce and promote among them, letters, arts, medical discoveries, im-

provements in husbandry, and methods of useful and legitimate commerce; to establish amicable correspondences; to encourage enterprise in exploring the unknown interior, not merely to gratify curiosity, but to obtain and disseminate useful knowledge; and to open sources of future intercourse." Granville Sharp was chosen one of the first Directors of this institution, at the advanced age of seventy-three, and until within half a year of his death, continued to give it his bright and powerful support.

Prisons and prisoners—hospitals and penitentiaries—houses of refuge, and all other benevolent objects shared his care. In the year 1800, a remarkable scarcity occurring, he displayed the wholesome temper of his mind, by proposing to the clerk of Bridewell hospital, that instead of the usual annual dinner, the stewards who were to have furnished the expenses of it, should supply a sum of equal amount, towards the necessities of the patients in Bethlehem hospital.

The sources from which he derived the funds, which he so largely distributed, were, the love of his brothers and other friends—the confidence reposed in him, as their almoner, by wealthy and benevolent individuals; and bequests left him for his own use, as well as for general beneficence.

His domestic affections were remarkably elegant and tender. An even cheerfulness of temper always distinguished him; and he was ever ready, with alacrity, when duty permitted, to dismiss business and study, and to join in the amusements of children. "How eagerly was the opening of his study door watched by his young relations, as the signal for mirth and play; how gaily did they bound at the notes of his tabor and pipe; how frequently did his ready pencil delight them, with delineations of birds, or beasts, or flowers, &c." He was peculiarly fond of the company of young persons in general; and the overflowing kindness of his heart towards them, met with a rich and sweet return in their artless and generous affections.

In sickness, he was a tender and edifying nurse.

His benevolence extended to animals. His heart told

him, that the miseries to which they have become heirs through man's rebellion, ought not to suffer aggravation from human despotism. He was ever prompt, therefore, to alleviate their condition, as much as in his power, feeling that while "it is *glorious* to have a giant's strength—it is *tyrannous* to use it as a giant." "The wretch," he used to say, "who is bad enough to maltreat a helpless beast, would not spare his fellow man, if he had him as much in his power."

He travelled much, (always resting on the Sabbath) and greatly enjoyed the observation of endlessly varied character which he thus met with. *Edification* was his constant pursuit. One day, a fellow passenger, impatient at the delays on the road, burst out into immoderate rage, with many oaths. Sharp was silent at the time; but next morning he sought out the angry traveller, and earnestly remonstrated with him.

In his youth, he was the intimate friend of Sir William Jones; and when that admirable man was departing for the East Indies, Granville, in a fervent interview, urging the duty and privilege of prayer, said to him, "We have talked together on many subjects—but not sufficiently on the most material of all, the perfect reliance which we ought to feel upon the will of our Creator." Sir William delighted him, by replying, that "he was constant in prayer." These brother spirits, seem both to have entered deeply into the full import of the blessed injunction, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

In manners, Sharp was full of courtesy and of attentiveness to others—but his urbanity was subject to no *modes* of men—it was the gush of undissembling love, warm from his heart. It was the politeness of the Christ-like man, and not of the man of the world.

His mental faculties continued vigorous until the beginning of 1813, his seventy-eighth year, about half a year before his death. A rapid and painful decay then came on. His affections were as lively, and his sense of duty was as strong as ever; but his understanding tottered, and his memory failed. He was not himself, however, aware of

the decay, until awakened to it by a painful circumstance, in June, 1813. Feeling it *a duty* to go to London from Fulham, where he then resided; he could not be prevailed upon by the remonstrances of his friends, which he did not understand, to decline the journey; but started next morning by the public coach, before the family was up. When they arose, a servant was immediately despatched after him, but he could not be found. His heavenly Father, however, had not forgotten his "*little one.*" The generous coachman, who carried him to town, perceiving his altered state, felt much anxiety about him, and as soon as he had settled the business of the coach, hastened in search of him. He found him at the door of his chambers in the temple, wandering about in a state of incertitude, being unable to guide himself to that part of the city, which he wished to reach. He was easily prevailed upon to return to Fulham, as it was getting late, and was soon again in the tender circle of domestic love. His intellect partook of the decay of his body. But love was unwithering, like his soul.

He now saw death at his door, and was *almost* disappointed. He seems to have fancied that the millenial glory was close at hand, and that he should witness it in the body. It was but the change, however, of a delightful dream, into an all glorious reality. His *rest* was at hand. On the day preceding his death, he breakfasted, as usual, with the family. His weakness was great during the day, and repeatedly obliged him to lie down. He often seemed to labor for breath. Night and partial repose came on. On the morning of 6th July, 1813, the color of his countenance was changed, but its sweet expression remained. About four o'clock in the afternoon, he fell into a tranquil slumber, and soon afterwards, without a struggle or a sigh, while those who loved him watched him, and before they were sensible of his departure, he was asleep in the arms of Jesus. All that *could* die, of Granville Sharp, was *dead.* But Granville Sharp, the immortal man; the blood-bought sinner; the *little child* of God; the unbending and unwavering advocate of *all* righteousness; the servant of truth;

the friend of man, (not because he was black or white ; or Englishman or foreigner—but because he was God's creature, in God's image, for God's glory, the object of Christ's love, in hopes of heaven, in danger of hell, of one blood, and of one law, and of one calling with himself;) yes, Granville Sharp, the friend of man, then indeed *began* to live ! He slept. He wakened—but not as he had been used to waken ; still a prisoner in the body, and subject to all the ills to which it gives access—but "the sunshine of heaven beamed bright on his waking—and the song which he heard was the cherubims' song."

His departure was honored by various societies, and a monument in Westminster Abbey, in that part which is well known by the name of Poet's Corner, marks the public sense of his merits. On this monument, a lion and lamb are represented on one side, lying down together ; and on the other, an African, supplicating, in chains. The following is part of the inscription :

"He was incessant in his labours to improve the condition of mankind.
Founding public happiness, upon public virtue,
He aimed to rescue his native country from the guilt and inconsistency
Of employing the arm of freedom, to rivet the fetters of bondage ;
And established for the negro race, in the person of Somerset,
The long disputed rights of human nature :
Having in this glorious cause, triumphed over the combined resistance
of Interest, Prejudice and Pride."

A few general observations may be added, in relation to this dear brother in the Lord.

Although singularly blessed with an intuitive clearness, and correctness of judgment, and with the most generous and decided firmness in asserting and supporting his convictions, he was not quick at repartee, nor always powerful in *colloquial* reasoning. False conclusions rarely arose in his mind ; and false reasoning scarcely ever perplexed him. He deeply saw, but he could not always distinctly expose, *on the spot*, the sophistries of others. Hence, he sometimes appeared to be vanquished, when in God's sight, he was most triumphant ; when the thorough rectitude of his

mind, was rising above the poverty of his utterance, and his soul was rallying most mightily upon God. This appears to have been particularly the case in a conversation which he had with the celebrated Dr. Johnson, on the subject of impressing seamen. Johnson defended the practice, and overwhelmed Sharp with words. Sharp mourned, but was strengthened. He only saw the more clearly, the need in which that wildly noble, but much outraged class stood of an advocate; and he was only stirred up, the more vigorously to defend their sacred *rights*.

His regard for the established church, appears to me, to have been excessive—and his objections to Catholic emancipation, I cannot but condemn; but I am hereby taught a new lesson of humility, in relation to political and ecclesiastical questions; and I see, more clearly than ever, the vital necessity of distinguishing them from questions of *moral* and *eternal importance*, such as *religion* itself; *impartial equity; the rights of the poor; personal liberty and property; brotherly love*, &c.; that while I yield all the latitude which God has given them, to things of a *political* and *ecclesiastical* nature, I may follow God's exactness and invariableness, in relation to *moral* and *eternal things*.

He united, in an admirable manner, the respect due to office or condition, with the kindness due to the person who fills it, and with the candid boldness which truth demands. He rebuked severely; but he seems rarely to have given offence. Every body saw that he loved every body; and that the severity and constancy of his censures, sprung from the same holy source. There was a glorious consistency in him, which precluded all well grounded reproach. His favorite text of scriptural duty was, "The tree which beareth not good fruit, shall be cut down and cast into the fire."

"God appeared to have raised him up, and qualified him," says John Owen, "for the work of political and moral reformation. He had, in a measure, the spirit and power of Elijah. He was jealous for the Lord of hosts, and he hated iniquity with a perfect hatred; but with all

his ardor for reform, (an ardor which only expired with his life) he was full of loyalty and subordination.

HE RESTS WITH JESUS ;
" GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST ;
AND ON EARTH,
PEACE, GOOD WILL, TOWARDS MEN."

SECTION V.

THE preceding history, and the circumstances around me, force an additional topic upon my attention.

Granville Sharp has been quoted as a favorer of colonization—and even of *such* colonization, as the Colonization Society of the United States is now conducting. I know not whether the Virginia and Maryland colonization plans, have equally claimed him.

What is the fact? How shall we get at it? Where is our evidence?

We must seek it, I presume, 1st from the well known and ruling principles of his mind—2d from his own correspondence or memoranda, as far as we have access to them—3d, from a fair comparison between Sierra Leone and Liberia—4th, by examining together, the fundamental principles of the two establishments—5th, from an impartial consideration of the national state of mind, in both cases—and 6th, from the general character of their most congenial advocates.

Let us however understand our terms before we proceed.

By colonization, we mean, not *such* as William Penn's. The first settlement of Pennsylvania is a *colonial oasis*—no more like colonies in general, than the fresh springs of the desert, are like the burning sands, which surround them. We mean not missionary establishments, such as adorn the

islands of the Pacific, or such as pour over the hunted and scorched soul of the otherwise outraged aborigines of Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee, sweet rills of the water of life. But we mean colonies, such as those of Phœnicia and Athens—such as those of Spain and Portugal—such as those of France, Great Britain and Holland—such as Liberia itself; in fact, political and commercial colonies, whatever be their pretence. *Armed settlements*, of *civilized*, on the shores of *uncivilized* people.

If this be *not* our meaning. If, on the contrary, such colonies as William Penn's, or such as the missionary establishments of the British and American missionary societies, be meant—colonies without other weapons than the weapons which through Christ overcome by love and by suffering perseverance in well doing—our controversy is at an end. With delight I grant that of such colonies, Granville Sharp was the friend indeed.

Presuming however, that at present we have nothing to do with colonies of this unearthly description, but with such colonies as Liberia, &c., our question is, Was Granville Sharp a friend of such colonies as these?

What were the well known and ruling principles of his mind? They were eminently, *equity—love*—and *peace*. Equity without respect of colors or of persons—undissembling and holy love—harmless, suffering, Christ-like peace—the ministering spirit, like his Lord and master's conquering by services of love. Witness, his resignation of office, at the beginning of the revolutionary war, &c. The only exception of which I am aware is, that in 1780, when London was jeoparded by outrageous riots, he offered to become a citizen soldier during the emergency. This is an anomaly in his character—I do not attempt to account for it, and I will not defend it. It is, however, but an exception, and serves only to render the opposite rule, the law of peace, which governed his life, more lovely—or should *a fighter* scoff at this, and applaud, in *resisting evil*, the pouring out of brother's blood by brother, let him, if he be consistent, advocate the rising of the Russian serfs against their lordlings; or with greater emphasis still, the striking by vio-

lence for their liberties of the Southern slaves; since, if resisting evil by violence, ever can be right, it unquestionably must be eminently so, when slaves rise for their unforfeited liberties.

But no; Granville Sharp, was a friend of peace. He had studied his Bible too much, and loved it too well, to be ignorant of the injunctions, "love worketh no ill to its neighbor;" "resist not evil;" "recompense no man evil for evil;" "avenge not yourselves;" "be not overcome of evil—but overcome evil with good;" "love your enemies—bless them that curse you—do good to them that hate you—and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." Rom. xiii. 10; Matt. v. 39; Rom. xii. 17; 19; 21; Matt. v. 44.*

No; opposite, *eternally* and *totally opposite* as are war and peace, *so opposite* were the well known and ruling principles of Granville Sharp's mind, to the whole colonization spirit. Do we need an evidence. Look at Massachusetts Bay! Who stand shivering there? Voluntary exiles, preferring the *rights of conscience*, the rights of lawful liberty *in all things*, to friends, country, fortune, ease. The world has never seen a nobler band of colonists. If *armed* colonies of civilized people, could ever be a blessing

* Some time before the *legal* abolition of the African slave trade, a Jamaica planter purchased a fine young African, took him into his house, and made him his confidential slave. The young man felt his master's kindness and gave him his generous heart in return—some years had elapsed—a new cargo had just arrived, when his master falling in want of twenty additional hands, resorted with him to the slave market and committed the choice to him. The young African knowing no better, and wishing to please his master, immediately busied himself about the work, and had chosen several to his master's satisfaction, when suddenly he paused and stood transfixed before a poor old emaciated stranger that was groaning on the ground—"Go on," said his master, "that man won't do, you see he is old and sick." "Massa," cried the young African, "you must buy me dat man." "He wont do, I tell you," said his master impatiently, "go on immediately and choose the rest." "Massa," repeated the slave, "you must buy me dat man." And this was the only answer the master could get. The slave dealer hearing the angry words which followed, came up and said contemptuously, "Oh you need not make such a fuss about that old man—he is good for nothing—go along and please your master, and if we can agree about the rest, you shall have him into the bargain." The young African, immediately sprang forward—did his best—pleased his master—the bargain was made, and

to the uncivilized tribes amongst which they settle, our Pilgrim forefathers had been such! But it is out of nature—and even the christianity, to which it is akin, is deemed insane, by the *christianity of the world*, all *bristling* with bayonets, ready to pour showers of death from the cannon's mouth, and crimsoned over and over, with its brother's blood—such are armed colonies. They have always been, and must always be, while man is a sinner, and while christianity remains the proud and bloody thing which it yet is in this particular, in almost all the churches—like the blast of death to the poor native!! Strangers come, and he is swept from the land of his forefathers—*their* fields wave rich with corn—*their* trees hang heavy with fruit—*their* church spires pierce the skies—*their* outward Sabbaths are kept by multitudes—commerce, arts, arms flourish—literature is rife, and palace-like are the dwellings which adorn the land. But the law of God is meted and parceled out, at will, or by tradition. A man, walking close with Christ, is deemed a lunatic. Fashion and custom and public opinion are the gods, slavery is nursed in the lap of republics,—and the aboriginies have perished; or linger in oppressed and scattered remnants, a memento

---

receiving the sick old man, as promised, he immediately led him off to his hut, and became as a son to him. His best of every thing was appropriated to the dying stranger. When the wind blew chill through the rain, he hastened to cover, or to kindle a little fire to warm him. When the sun burnt and the air was still, he made him a couch under the thick tamarind, or sat beside and fanned his fainting brow. The master heard the facts, was affected, and coming kindly to the cottage said, "What makes you love that old man so? Is he your father?" "No, massa!" replied the young African, with great emotion, "he no my father!" "Is he your uncle!" "No, massa!" "Is he your brother—your neighbor—your friend, naming every connection he could think of: still the young African, mournfully answered, "No!" "Who is he then," exclaimed the master with surprise, "what makes you love him so." "Massa," replied the young African, solemnly, "dat man my worst enemy—derfore me love him so—when me live in my own country, wid my own dear fader and moder dat man come steal me—carry me away—sell me to de slave dealers—massa me no more see my country—or my fader or my moder. Yes, massa, dat man my worst enemy—derfore me love him so, cause massa, in dat good book you teach me read, de great God, say, 'Love your enemies—if dy enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst, give him drink—be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil wid good.'"

to armed colonies, of the cruel iniquity of their heart, and of the daring hypocrisy of their boastings.

Liberia has already waded through two wars—*defensive* wars—wars, we will suppose, as virtuous as wars can be. Her first hero, exulted in the play of cannon balls, plunging like lightning upon that solid mass of human flesh, then at Monrovia. The blood of the heathen in his sins, has crimsoned her. When God "maketh inquisition for blood," will he not remember them alike, the conquerors and the conquered?

Yes—Granville Sharp, the man of peace, and armed colonies prepared to overcome evil with evil, are each others antipodes.

2d. Can we get any further light from his correspondence or memoranda?

In the volume from which I chiefly draw my materials for this short memoir, (Memoir's of Granville Sharp, by *Prince Hoare*, London, 1820) I find a very interesting letter from Samuel Hopkins to him, dated "Newport, Rhode Island, 15th January, 1789," together with Granville's reply. Samuel Hopkins declares his having felt it his duty to condemn and to preach against both the slave trade (1) and slavery, *publicly;* he says that a conviction of the evil of those practices was spreading, and notices the New-York and Philadelphian societies, which I have mentioned. He states that in Massachusetts, all were free, &c., &c. "But," adds he, "the circumstances of the freed blacks, are in many respects unhappy, while they live here among the whites;(2) as the latter look down upon the former, and are disposed to treat them as *underlings*, and deny them the advantages of education and employment, &c., which tends to depress their minds, and prevent their obtaining a comfortable living, and involves them in many other disadvantages. This and other considerations (3) have led many of them to desire to return to Africa (4) and settle there among their equals and brethren, and in a country and climate more natural to them than this. Particularly there are a number of religious (5) blacks, with whom I am acquainted, who wish

to be formed into a distinct church or religious society; and to have a black appointed to be their pastor (and there is one at least, who is thought to be qualified for that office) and then to go, with all the blacks that shall be willing to move with them, to Africa, and settle on lands, which they think may be obtained of some of the nations there, from whom some of them were taken, and whose language they retain; and there maintain the profession and practice of christianity, (6) and spread the knowledge of it, among the Africans, as far as they shall have opportunity; at the same time cultivating their lands, and introducing into that hitherto uncivilized country, the arts of husbandry, building mills and houses, and other mechanic arts, and raising tobacco, cotton, coffee, indigo, &c., for exportation as well as for their own use."

Samuel Hopkins then proceeds to mention the reports which he had heard respecting Sierra Leone—proposes several questions, and thus concludes: "Finally, whether the blacks in New England, who have been educated and habituated to industry and labor, either on lands or as mechanics, and are thereby prepared to bring forward such a settlement better, I believe, than any other blacks that can be found—whether these blacks can have any part of those lands to settle themselves upon, and on what terms, and what encouragement and assistance might they probably have?"

G. Sharp in a letter dated Leadenhall-street, 25th July, 1789, states the difficulties and disasters which the colony had experienced, and its *then* revived condition. He offers no lure to Hopkins' project, but assures him of a kind reception of the objects of his care, should they come as British subjects, and "*all at one time.*" He mentions being informed that the laws were very good; the neighboring natives very civil; and King Naimbana a cordial friend; and he dwells in conclusion, upon the difficulty and importance of providing the settlement with a "*live stock of cattle,*" as they had none.

The glaring discordances between these views and the American Colonization system may thus be briefly noticed.

(1) Samuel Hopkins speaks boldly and publicly against slavery—the A. C. S. excuses it. (2) He mentions the wrong which the colored people were suffering, throwing the guilt where it rested upon the whites!—the A. C. S. attaches the guilt to the suffering colored people, and excuses the whites who *are* the actual criminals. (3) S. H. is moved by the wishes of the sufferers themselves—the A. C. S. is acting in direct and open violation of the almost universal wishes of the sufferers. (4) Most of the colored people spoken of by S. H. were Africans themselves, or, had still relations and acquaintances in Africa, and retained the languages of that country!—the colored people, about whom the A. C. S. busy themselves, are almost universally Americans, and know nothing of the languages of Africa. (5) S. H. speaks of his *proteges*, in the most respectful and affectionate terms—the A. C. S. slander most grossly and cruelly the pretended objects of their benevolence. (6) S. H. speaks of *his* poor, as *already* qualified by principles and habits long established, and by attainments already made, to be a blessing to Africa—the A. C. S. speaks of *theirs*, as about to be *transmuted* by passing the Atlantic, from semi-devils to semi-angels, to more than men! in the United States, unfit to be allowed to remain in their native country! but in Africa, above all human influences, uncorrupt and incorruptible; such men and women as the world has never seen; as the United States, with all its *real* glory, and with all its cruel boasts, *has not!* (7) Granville Sharp in his reply, bids the strangers welcome, but allures them by no fairy tales of Sierra Leone—the A. C. S. made Liberia as much and as long as it could, a little paradise. (8) Both G. S. and S. H. were evidently the ministers and servants in love for Christ's sake, of the people of their care—the A. C. S. takes sides with their slanderers and oppressors, and spurns them with all the benevolence of aristocratic pride from their native country. Can darkness and light—can right and wrong be more opposite. If any one ask for my authorities, I refer them to the Annual Reports and to the African Repositories of the American Colonization Society, and to Judge Jay's admirable book;

as well as to any of my own *more recent* tracts, which may fall in their way, especially to "Prejudice Vincible, by better means than slavery and exile."

3d. A fair comparison between Sierra Leone and Liberia.

Sierra Leone was provided as a place of refuge, not for Englishmen, but for poor strangers most of whom were Africans. Liberia was provided for people, almost all of whom were born and bred in the United States, and are therefore as truly Americans as any other natives of that country.

The settlers of Sierra Leone, were distressed in England, by the distant colonial wickedness (of which the United States largely partook, slavery in the United States being coadjutor in it with West Indian slavery) which made them exiles, and with the exuberant native English population, which left little or no demand for their labor. The settlers of Liberia were distressed *at home*, by the inflated and iniquitious heart of their country, refusing them honest employments, despising them as "*underlings*" and goading them to exile, as the only means of honor and of happiness.

The founders of Sierra Leone, were the servants in love of the settlers. The founders of Liberia (with two or three exceptions) were the slanderers and despisers of the settlers, *till* they could get them to a *sufficient distance*.

The founders of Sierra Leone, contemplated removing those *only* who were *really* in distress in England from *providential circumstances*, or who, being Africans, were anxious to return to their native country: holding those who chose to remain, as honored and as welcome in England as any of the rest of its inhabitants. The founders of Liberia contemplated removing, *a whole people*, as they may be called (the free colored people of the United States) some of whom were wealthy—some of whom were highly cultivated—some of whom were amongst the most precious jewels in their country, of the Lord of hosts—many of whom were in independant circumstances, and all of whom taking them as a body, might have been most happy and useful at home—and why then remove them? Why, to

gratify an eminently insane and cruel state of public feeling—and how? Why, by taking sides with that insane and cruel feeling, and by flattering its wickedness in order to obtain its insolent and supercilious aid.

Love; impartial, brotherly, christian love, was the source of Sierra Leone. Hatred and contempt for *color*—or often in defiance of all truth, and in contempt of all evidence for what is *called* color—or for one drop of African, though mingled with streams of European blood; or, more absolutely than for either of these, for the *enormous crime*, of their poor mothers' having been most shamelessly and iniquitously degraded and outraged before them. *Such* hatred and contempt, were the great source, and still continue the efficient support of Liberia—so thoroughly so, that would the *orthodox*, (not *ortho-prax*) color of the United States, but return to its senses, to republicanism and its manhood, there would remain *no* reason for sending a single additional settler to Liberia, *on the colonization plan;* but *every* reason, for cherishing them in love, in their native country; and for making them all the amends which *unfeigned* repentance *would* make, for the cruel indignities and wrongs so long and so criminally heaped upon them, the present *cement* and climax of which *is*, striving to get their free portion off, as decently as possible, to a foreign and barbarous land!

The settlement of Sierra Leone, cherished the best feelings of the English nation—sympathy for the oppressed, and benevolence towards desolate strangers, whom the *proud* world spurned and persecuted.

The founding of Liberia, cherished the worst feelings of the people of the United States; the idol-sin, which distinguishes them from all other civilized people, *color hatred*, or rather, *mother-hatred*, since an oppressed and outraged, *not guilty*, *mother*, is the only definite criterion of it; color being frequently *darker* amongst the *whites!!* than amongst the *colored* people!

How strikingly, also, is the holy faithfulness of Samuel Hopkins, in speaking and preaching, publicly, against slavery, contrasted with the present colonization coverings-up

of that most atrocious system—and how affectingly does the brotherly respect and love, which his letter displays for the colored people, compare with the slanderous contempt and abuse of them, trumpeted over the world by the Colonization Society.

4th. What are the fundamental principles of the two establishments? Those of Sierra Leone, we have seen in page 60. They are full of benignity to Africa; not "by purchase of territory"—or "commercial speculation"—or "colonial settlement"—but by means of light and law! Not a word is said to disparage the poor settlers, in England, or to point out Africa to them, as the *only* refuge from British insanity, cruelty and pride.

The *exclusive object* of the American Colonization Society, "is to promote and execute a plan for colonizing (with their consent) the free people of color, residing in our country, in Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient. And the society shall act, to effect this object, in cooperation with the general government, and such of the states as may adopt regulations on the subject."

As if "*our country*," were not the country of the free people of color, as much as *ours!* As if consent, *thus* obtained, under existing circumstances *here*, *could*, in general, be *voluntary!* As if a society, acting *in concert* with Nicholas, of Russia, in sending the poor Poles to Siberia, could be just and benignant towards the Poles. As if a heathen and uncivilized country, *could* be the place, to which undissembling love would send guiltless and unaccused American citizens, from a land, so glorious in many respects, as the United States are!

But I pause, and refer my readers to "Jay's Inquiry," thanking God for such a timely and unanswerable exposition of the real character and influences of the American Colonization Society.

5th. What was the state of the national mind in Great Britain, compared with America?

The English loved and cherished strangers, *irrespectively of color*—and if oppressed or wronged, they obtained a dou-

ble share of sympathy. The suffering people of color, as peculiarly outraged and afflicted, were objects of peculiar compassion to them. The hearts of Englishmen were their home, even while colonial guilt made England, also, a house of bondage to them—but the British mind, after writhing for a while under the abomination, threw it finally and forever off, as we have seen in 1772. England remained *their* country, *as it is* the country of *every man in the world*, who flies to it *from oppression*. *No white* man is more honored *there*, than *brown* men, or *sallow*, or *yellow* men—or *pale* men, or *red* men; or white haired, or red haired, or black haired, or yellow haired, or brown haired, or curly haired, or long haired men—the only difference being, moral character and conduct. The black man; the man of mixed blood; the man, whose mother had been oppressed, not criminal—as honored and protected *there*, as a man of any possible tinge which a blanco-idolater *could* fabricate, even were he endowed with the powers of creation.

When the American Colonization Society was formed, what was the United States' mind! What is it now?

Full of color-phobia! The land is full of it. It is exhibited in legislation, in custom and in feeling. The man is deemed a fool or a villain who is free from it. It is, above all, exhibited in its *perfection*, when thorough Colonizationists try to disprove it. Even the kind couple with whom I am now boarding, full of general kindness as they are, are full of it. "What! a colored man to be equal to *me!! me*, of the orthodox blood; (though *browner* than many of them!!) What! a colored man, tinged with the blood of suffering and of wrong, *endured*, *not perpetrated*, to be equal with *me!!*" Oh, horrible! Does not *nature* itself, cry out against it!!!

Some years ago, (not many) the King of Persia, hearing the United States mentioned, exclaimed, "The United States! What is the United States? Where is it? How big is it? Is it *under ground* or *above ground?* What kind of people inhabit it? Are they black or white, civilized or savage?" Was the King of Persia to be admired? Yet he spoke the feeling of his country—and there are

many more people in Persia, than in the United States; and if *numbers* made *nature*, the United States are despicable; for the numerous Persians despised them!!!

Mungo Park, when on the point of perishing, was compassionated by a poor African, and generously lodged and entertained in his hut. The African's wife was terrified by the entrance of the pale-faced stranger, and getting out of the door as fast as she civilly could, ran off, screaming, "the devil!—the devil!" Was her feeling right? Yet she had much reason to believe white people devils; and she had not the scriptures, or science, or the preaching of the gospel, to teach her the glorious fact, that "God hath made of one blood, all the nations of the earth;" and that *that* poor, unprotected, emaciated, unintroduced, except by his miseries, pale-faced stranger, was her brother, whom she was bound to honor and to love. Besides, it is calculated, that there are about one hundred and fifty millions of people in Africa, while there are only about twelve millions of pale-faced ones (or rather *called* pale-faced ones, since they are of many colors,) in the United States, and any child therefore, who understands the single rule of three, can tell, that Africa has more than twelve times a better right to settle what "nature's" feelings are, than the people of the United States have; and that, therefore, by twelve odds to one, all *really* pale-faced people are devils! Then *surely*, abundant means of *knowing* better, do not render proud and cruel *notions*, less criminal or less absurd!

This *color-phobia;* this *distinguishing characteristic* of the United States, from which *all other civilized people* are free, *was* the precursor and the source, and *is* the support of the Colonization Society. It existed long before that society was organized—but it was comparatively insulated in individual bosoms, and was proportionably feeble. The Colonization Society is simply, *its embodying and disciplining*—and the difference is, that it *now* has the *power of union*. "Go to Africa," it says to the outraged class—hated and spurned *because they are outraged;* "go to Africa, and we will do all we can to make you happy. But *this*

is not your country—though you have served it as faithfully; and according to your opportunities, done as much for it; and behaved as well in it, all things fairly considered; and when occasion called, poured out your blood for it, as cheerfully and as bravely, as we have—yet it is not *your* country—it is the *white* man's land—that is, it is the land of the men of all colors, by courtesy called white amongst themselves, who, as a body, have always been your spurners and your tyrants, and never your slaves! Off—off to Africa, your fathers' land; though half of you have more *orthodox* than *heterodox blood* in your veins; and *there*, in a comparative wilderness, surrounded by barbarian despotisms, and in the midst of a heathen people, not yet *gospel-hardened*, far away forever from your native country, you may find a degree of equity and kindness, which in the United States, your native land, you never can."

The national state of mind in England, was and is, that of a *brother* and a *friend*, towards the free colored people. The national state of mind towards them, in the United States, was and is, (except when their aid has been needed in times of danger and emergency; witness Gen. Jackson's orders near New Orleans, last war;) a contemptuous sufferance, or a supercilious benignity. "Stand off," it says, "we are better than ye. Keep *far* enough from our moon-colored nobility, and we will *magnanimously* suffer you!"

Here it may be useful to remark, that the *color*, with any propriety called *white*, extends not to one-tenth of the human family; and, that little more than one-tenth of this tenth, is afflicted with the *color-phobia*.* That is, about *one* person in a hundred of the whole human family, is subject to this cruel disease; and *then*, *he*, in his hallucinations, dreams that *his* feelings are the law of *nature!* and that whoever does not feel as he *he* does, is a fool or a villain.

But this cruel and criminal madness, is beneath the *colored nine-tenths* of the world—and to all the *white* people

* The terror which the Africans have of white men, is rather the terror of the reputation which white men have acquired amongst them, of cannibalism, robbery and murder, than of color.

in the world, except the *whites* "*of all colors*" in the United States, and a few hundreds of *colonial slave masters and slave drivers*, is matter of pity and abhorrence. Proud, unjust and cruel as in *other* respects they may be, in *this*, other nations have not yet departed so utterly, from God and their poor brother. And blessed be His holy name, this storm of all hypocritical and savage iniquity in the United States, is intermitting. Far off to leeward, I see the clear blue sky, breaking through the clouds. A voice of *love* is loudly sounding—a cry of *justice* is echoing through the land. Truth is rising in its peaceful, all conquering might. The press, is in a measure, rescued. The pulpit is casting off its shameful fetters. The institutions of learning are heaving away the incubus. *Men—lovers of liberty*, all glorious, impartial liberty. *Republicans*, not with a lying and boastful tongue merely, but in heart and in deed. The *yeomen peasantry of the free states*, wanting information only, to stir them up in love; as *lovers* of *liberty*, and not as *idolaters* of *partial and despotic pride*. *White men*; yes white men of the United States, most of them just cured of the color-phobia, uniting in a noble and rapidly increasing phalanx, are coming up, in peace, to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and the prospect is most cheering, that soon, the curse of Meroz shall no longer lower over this glorious land.

6th. What was the general character of the most congenial minds, in founding the two settlements in question?

Need I repeat the character of the founder of Sierra Leone. It is before my readers.

But who were the founders of Liberia? Mills, I cannot take into the account, for *he* was not a colonizationist, but a missionary. Finley, must be included; and highly interesting as his character seems to have been in other respects, in *this*, an independent and impartial mind, need only mark the *first* motive which he gives for his *colonization zeal*, "we should be cleared of them," to perceive at once, how deeply he was implicated in his country's wickedness. Of Caldwell, I am too ignorant to speak. And who were the rest? Most, if not all, slave masters! The *Virginian*

Legislature was its precursor. Bushrod Washington, a slave breeder and vender and holder, presided at its first meeting, and became its first president. Henry Clay, proclaimed in England by Elliot Cresson, as its champion; *Henry Clay*, who, after declaring, that "of all descriptions" of the population of the United States, "and of either portion of the African race, the *free persons of color*, are by far, the most corrupt, depraved and abandoned;" (African Repository VI. 12.) goes on in the same speech to affirm, that "the Society proposes to send out, not one or two pious members of christianity into a foreign land, but to transport annually, for an indefinite number of years, in one view of its scheme six thousand, in another fifty-six thousand missionaries, of the descendants of Africa itself, to communicate the benefits of our religion and the arts." African Repos. VI. 24. I know not how, *thorough infatuation*, on a particular subject, could be more strikingly exhibited, than by a man of Henry Clay's giant grasp of mind, demurely *thus* reasoning, and then being applauded as their hero, by the Society's agent! Evangelizing and civilizing Africa, by yearly deluges of the most corrupt, depraved and abandoned people of the United States. What sanity! What benevolence!! Of seventeen vice-presidents only five were selected from the free states—and the whole of the twelve managers, as far as I can learn, were slave holders.

Such were the materials which founded Liberia. *Since* its foundation, better men have added their names; and its list *still* contains many of them—*some*, in *other* respects, not surpassed on earth. The heart which loves its Saviour and his holy cause, and is not in bondage to the same delusion, can only bleed over the fact; but is comforted by remembering that *deep* as the noblest minds may fall at times, *if true to God*, they shall rise again, and only shine the more brightly, from the depth of their past eclipse.

Light and darkness could as easily have become homogeneous as Granville Sharp, could have united with such a company. The portrait of Bushrod Washington taken to England by Elliot Cresson to be placed beside that of Wm.

Wilberforce in the London Anti Slavery Society's office, was refused a place there by the coadjutors and successors of Granville Sharp. The same fountain does not send forth waters both bitter and sweet—"neither does the fig bear olives—nor the vine, figs." James iii. 11, 12. Granville Sharp, the philanthropist, (not the blanco-idolater) and Bushrod Washington, or Henry Clay, are in this respect, at the uttermost antipodes. Where, as above mentioned, men of a different and superior stamp, have become supporters of the Colonization Society, they have been out of place. Some of them have repented and brought forth fruits mete for repentance. Over the rest, impartial love, wonders and mourns, looking with confidence, to their rescue at no distant day, from their present thraldom.

In fine, whether we consider the well known and ruling principles of Granville Sharp's mind—or advert to his correspondence and memoranda—whether we compare Sierra Leone and Liberia, or contrast their fundamental principles—whether we contemplate the national state of mind in both cases, or the general character of the most congenial advocates of either, we are more and more struck, with the utter discordancy between the two, and are satisfied that had our beloved brother lived, his name would have graced William Wilberforce's *protest; that crowning act of his life*, against the absurd and cruel pursuit of colonizationism in the United States, whether concentrated in the form of the Colonization Society, or scattered in its pristine and unorganized form, over the land.

A distinguishing feature of the colonization mania, may here be noticed in conclusion.

Let a man speak the truth, of the insane and cruel prejudice against color in the United States, declaring however, that it is *vincible*, and explaining the manly, peaceable and republican process, by which it is actually undergoing a glorious change—and, if an American, he is a *slanderer* of his country, or a *traitor*, or *something*, or *any thing* else, which the color-phobia fancies:—if an Englishman, he "*has been imported, for the purpose of vilifying colonization*,"

or for some other purpose, of equally false and elegant tissue.

But let him declare this *brutal* prejudice, *not brutal*; let him palm it upon God, as the Colonization Society does in its 15th Annual Report; let him assert that it is *invincible*, as Jefferson did; let him unite with the Connecticut Colonization Society, in saying, "The African" (*take notice*, most of them are *Americans* all the while) "in *this country*" (i. e. in his *native* country) "belongs by birth to the very lowest station in society; and from that station, he can never rise, be his talents, his enterprise, his virtues, what they may. They" (the free negroes, i. e. the *free Americans* whose unhappy parents or ancestors, *suffered*, not committed, the curse of slavery) "constitute a class by themselves; a class out of which no individual can be elevated, and below which none can be depressed. And *this* is the *difficulty*, the *invariable* and *insuperable* difficultly, in the way of every scheme for their benefit. Much can be done for them—much has been done for them; but still they are, and in *this country*, always must be, a depressed and abject race. * * * In every part of the United States, there is a broad and *impassable* line of demarcation between every man, who has *one drop* of *African blood* in his veins, and every other class in the community;" together with the following words of the same address prefixed to the passage just quoted: "The habits, the feelings, all the prejudices of society—prejudices of which neither refinement, nor argument, nor education, nor religion itself can subdue, mark the *people of color*" (note—this should have been, the Americans who had *one drop of African blood* in their veins) whether bond or free, as the subjects of a degradation, *inevitable* and *incurable*." Yes—let a man, thus trumpet the shame of the United States through the world, usurping God's place, and giving them over to final and utter impenitence in this ferocious and libertine sin, and he shall be a champion—a loyal and true-hearted man!!! What difference is there between *this*, and the Hindoo, who reviles and spurns, whoever worships not his

juggernaut with him; but hugs and applauds his fellow idolaters? except, that the poor Hindoo, has *no Bible*, and *little comparative civilization;* and *no republican constitution* declaring *gloriously*, that all men are created free and equal, and are endowed by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights, amongst which are "life, *liberty*, and the *pursuit of happiness*" to stimulate or secure his integrity, *if upright;* or, *if a renegado* from his principles, to leave him without a cloak for his guilt.

And that the extent and malignity of the ground-work, of this feeling may not rest upon an *adversary's* report, look at the description given by the friends of the Colonization Society, of the particular species of slavery on which the prejudice above adverted to arose, and by which it is still nourished.

"On the subject of slavery, we must express ourselves briefly, yet *boldly*. We have heard of slavery as it exists in Asia and Africa and Turkey—we have heard of the feudal slavery under which the peasantry of Europe have groaned from the days of Alaric until now; but excepting only, the horrible system of the West India Islands, we have never heard of slavery in any country, ancient or modern, pagan, mahomedan, or *christian! so terrible in its character, so pernicious in its tendency*, so *remediless in its anticipated results*, as the *slavery* which exists in these United States." 7th Report, Amer. Col. Soc. 1824.

But—blessed be God! Dagons greater than this, and than the ferocious prejudice, the color-phobia, in the United States, which is its offspring have fallen before the ark of the Lord—and shall fall again—and *this* shall fall! Truth is great and must prevail—we "can do all things, through Christ who strengtheneth" us: and if *we* prove unfaithful; if daunted by the fear, or allured by the favor of man; if drawn aside by our own corruptions, or swept away by the awakened wrath of the enemies of equity and peace, let loose upon us—God will not want *other and better instruments*, and provided there be "*glory to him in the highest—and on earth, peace, good will to man*"—to the *poor* man,

as well as to the rich man!—to the *ignorant* man, as well as to the learned man!—to the *black* man, and to *men of all colors*, as well as to the white man!—to *the stranger*, as well as to the citizen!—to the *poor sufferer of wrong*, delivered from outrage, as well as to the *perpetrator of wrong*, brought to repentance! *our* work will be accomplished, and our heart's desire fulfilled.

APPENDIX.

NO. 1.

In Sharp's tract, on "the injustice and dangerous tendency of tolerating slavery," published in London, by Benjamin White, Fleet-street, 1769, after quoting York and Talbot's opinion of Jan. 14, 1729, he states, that thirty years prior to this opinion, in the case of Gallway versus Caddee, before Baron Thompson, at Guildhall, the slave was *judged* to be free, "*from his first setting foot on English ground.*"

He records a similar judgment in 1732, in the case of De Penna, &c. versus Henriquez; and Lord Chief Justice Holt's prior decision, "that as soon as a negro comes into England, he becomes free"—"one may be a villain in England, but not a slave."

He cites the following glorious principles of law.

"The law favors liberty." Wood's Inst. B. 1, c. 1, p. 25. Coke's 1st Inst. B. 124, and 2d Inst. 42, 115.

"The law favoreth a man's person before his possessions." Noyes' Maxims, p. 6 and 7.

"Quoties dubia interpretatio libertatis est, secundum libertatem respondendum." Digest. Lib. 50, Tit. 17, Leg. 20. Whenever the question of liberty seems doubtful, the decision must be in favor of liberty.

"The inferior law must give place to the superior—man's laws to God's laws." Noye's Maxims. If, therefore, any statute be enacted contrary to these, it ought to be considered of no authority in the laws of England. Etiam si aliquod statutum esse editum contra eas (that is against the laws of God) nullius vigoris, in legibus Angliæ, censeri debet. (Pages 55, 56, of another tract, entitled "Just limitation of slavery.")

"Usage and custom, generally received, have the force of law." Hale's History of Common Law, p. 65.

"Quia consuetudo, ex certa causa rationabile usitata, privat communem legem;" because custom, derived from a certain reasonable cause, takes the place of law. Littleton, Lib. 2, c. 10, sec. 149.

But "consuetudo, contra rationem introducta, potius usurpatio, quam consuetudo, appellari debet." When custom is adopted *without reason*, it ought rather to be called usurpation than custom.

"Quia, in consuetudinibus, non diuturnitas temporis, sed soliditas rationis, est consideranda." Because in judging of customs, strength of reason is to be considered, and not length of time. The reason which supports them ought to be regarded, and not the length of time, during which they have prevailed.

Two incidents are indispensable to validity of custom or usage:

1st. A reasonable commencement (for all customs or prescriptions which are against reason, are void.) 2d Inst. p. 140.

2d. Continuance without interruption.

"Malus usus abolendus est." Evil customs ought to be abolished. Littleton, 2 Inst. c. 2, p. 141. On which Sir Edward Coke remarks, that "every use (*or custom*) is evil, which is against reason—because, as above, "in consutuedinibus, non diuturnitas temporis, sed soliditas rationis, est consideranda."

"Debile fundamentum, fallit opus." Noyes' Maxims, p. 5. Where the foundation is weak, the structure falls.

"Quod ab initio non valet, in tractu temporis, non convalescit." Noyes' Maxims, p. 4. What is invalid from the beginning, cannot be made valid by length of time.

"Derivata potestas, non potest esse major primitiva." Derived power, cannot be superior to the power from which it is derived. Noyes' Maxims, p. 3.

Before any contract can be valid, the civil law requires three conditions as indispensable:

1st. That the parties contracting should have a legal capacity.

2d. They must be willing to contract—because "In ea, quæ ex duorum pluriumve consensu agitur, omnium voluntas spectitur." In those things which relate to the consent of two or more, the will of every one is regarded. And again, "In conventionibus, contrahentium voluntatem, potius quam verba, spectare placuit." Digest. xliv. vii. 31, and l. xvi. 219. In every agreement, the will rather than the words of the contracting parties is to be regarded.

3d. The parties must have liberty—for "Nil consensui tam contrarium est, quam vis atque metus; quem comprobare, contra bonos mores est." Nothing is so discordant with consent, as force and fear—it is a crime against the good of society, to approve of them." Digest. l. xvii. 116. Yet "vani timoris, justa excusatio, non est;" unreasonable fear, is not a sufficient excuse; l. xvii. 184; but, "Vis est, majoris rei impetus, quod

repelli non potest;" force consists in such a power as you cannot resist.

"Servitus est constitutio juris gentium, qua, quis, domino alieno, contra naturam subjicitur." Inst. Lib. 1, Tit. 3. Leg. 2. Slavery is a regulation of the law of nations, by which any body, is unnaturally subjected to the dominion of another.

"Crudelis etiam necessario judicabitur lex quæ servitutem augmentat, et minuit libertatem: nam pro ea, natura semper implorat humana. Quia, ab homine pro vitio introducta est servitus. Sed libertas, a Deo, hominis est indita natura. Quare ipsa ab homine subiata, semper redire gliscit, ut facit omne quod libertati naturali privatur. Quo impius et crudelis judicandus est qui libertati non favet. Hac considerantia, Angliæ jura, in omni casu, libertati dant favorem." Chancellor Fortescue, De laudibus Legum. c. 42, p. 101. The law therefore, which supports slavery, and opposes liberty, must necessarily be condemned as cruel: for every feeling of human nature advocates liberty. Slavery is introduced through human wickedness; but God advocates liberty by the nature which he has given to man. Wherefore, liberty torn from man, always seeks to return to him; and it is the same with every thing, which is dedeprived of its native freedom. On this account it is, that the man who does not favor liberty, must be regarded as impious and cruel; and hence the English law always favors liberty.

"Ratio legis, est animus legis." The resonableness of the law, is the soul of the law. Jenks' Cent. 45.

"Scribitur hæc lex in corde cujuslibet hominis, docens eum quid agendum, et quid ugiendum: et quod rationis, in corde scribitur, idio deleri non potest, nec enim recepit mutationem ex loco nec tempore, sed ubique et inter omnes homines, servari debet. Nam jura naturalia, *immutabilia* sunt; et ratio immutationis, est quod recipiunt naturam rei pro fundamenta, quæ semper eadem est, et ubique." Doct. and Stud., c. 2. This law is written upon the heart of every man, teaching him what to choose and what to refuse. What is written by reason in the heart, cannot be effaced; neither is it liable to change from either place or time, but ought to be preserved every where by all men. For the laws of nature are *immutable;* and the reason of their immutability is this, that they have for their foundation, the nature of things, which is always and every where the same.

"Contra eam non est præscriptio vel oppositum statutum, sive consuetudo, et si aliqua fiant, non sunt statuta, sive consuetudines, sed corruptela." Doct. and Stud. B. 5. Against this there is no prescription or statute, or usage; and should any be enacted, they would not be statutes, or usages, but corrupt customs.

Quia illa potestas, (juris) solius Dei est; potestas autem injuriæ, diaboli, et non Dei; et cujus horum opera fecerit rex, ejus minister erit, cujus opera fecerit (Rom. vi. 16.) Igitur dum facit justitiam, vicarius est Regis Eterni; minister autem diaboli, dum declinat ad injuriam." Bracton, Lib. 3, c. 9, p. 106–7. The lawful power is from God alone; but the power of wrong, is from the devil and not from God; and whosesoever work a king shall do, *his* servant he is, whose work he does. Wherefore, when he does justice, he is the minister of the Eternal King—but when he does unrighteousness, he is the servant of the devil. "Dicitur enim rex, a bene regendo, et non a regnando; quia rex est dum bene regit. Tyrannus, dum populum sibi creditum, violenta opprimet dominatione." Ibid. For he is called a king (ruler) for ruling righteously, and not because he reigns. Wherefore, he is a king, when he governs with justice—but a tyrant, when he oppresses the people committed to his charge.

"For though custom, tribute, fear and honor, are certainly due to him, who is the minister of God to us for good; yet surely *no honor* is due, or ought to be rendered to the minister of the devil; to the perjured violator of a public trust, who in the eye of the English law, is not even worthy of so much as the name of a king." Granville Sharp's "Law of passive obedience," p. 75.

"All men therefore, be they ever so rich, or ever so poor and mean, are required to vindicate the cause of truth, justice and righteousness, whenever they have a favorable opportunity of doing so;" p. 89. "An hereditary knowledge of good and evil, is a talent committed to all men, for the use or abuse of which therefore, all are accountable in exact proportion to the extent of the gift;" p. 89, 90. "The hasty revenger of his own cause, is so far from being a friend to the community, or a lover of liberty, that he himself, is actually a tyrant; because he neglects the necessary doctrine of *christian submission to personal injuries;* and is ready to revenge his own cause, with his own hand, and to usurp all the distinct offices of *Judge*, *Jury* and *Executioner*. He is so far from vindicating the law, like the generous and patriotic apostle, for *the sake of national liberty*, that he manifestly sets himself up above the law, (which is the first characteristic of a tyrant) and thereby renders himself, in fact, an open enemy to liberty, and consequently a disgrace to society;" ibid.

"When they (*men*) are freest they have limits, for they are not infinite; nay, when they are *most free*, they are *most bound* to good order and to right reason." Sadler's Rights, p. 135.

And in Blackstone's Commentaries, Chitty's edition, 1826, we read:

"The law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God

himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe; in all countries, and at all times. No human laws have any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid, derive all their force and all their authority, mediately or immediately from this original." And again, "Those rights which God and nature have established, and which are therefore called 'natural rights,' such as *life* and *liberty*, need not the aid of human laws, to be more effectually vested in every man, than they are. Neither do they receive any additional strength, when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable. On the contrary, no human legislation has power to abridge or destroy them, unless the owner shall himself commit some act, that amounts to forfeiture." Introduction, Section 2.

"Law favoreth life, liberty and dower. Law regards the *person* above his possessions—*life and liberty most*," &c. Principia Legis and Equitatis, p. 56.

Such are the glorious foundations of British, eternal and universal law. Such are the principles which, *without partiality* and *without hypocrisy*, yield "glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will, to man." Such are the principles, which an American, cast away upon the shores of Morocco, would wish to find prevailing there. Such are the principles, without which, all boasts of liberty, are but a lie; a triumph of licentiousness over freedom; the boast of the strong, and the bane of the weak! Such are the principles, the universal prevalence of which, would make the world a moral Eden—the rejection of which, keeps it a little hell; *especially* where *freemen* hold slaves; for of all governments, an oligarchy is the worst. It consists of a hundred, or a thousand, or ten thousand tyrants, instead of one. It is "diffusing tyranny every where." It is "*bringing despotism home to every man's door*." It involves the greatest deliberateness and desperation of iniquity, both *with* law and *without law*, which it is possible for power to perpetrate against weakness. And this enormous concatenation of all possible wickedness, is at its climax, when the oligarchs, the petty despots, the *plantation* tyrants *most boast* of freedom!! Witness Sparta and Athens, and republican Rome, in ancient times—in modern, witness the colonies of France, Holland and England. At this moment, see especially the United States; and at their apex, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Missisippi and Louisiana.

NO. 2.

In the year 1824, a little band of *refugee slaves*, that is, of *guiltless British subjects*, who had fled in *peace*, from the *the most iniquitous*

and galling oppression, was discovered in the woody mountains of Trelawny, in Jamaica; their number was nine men, eight women, and four children.

It appears that several years had elapsed, since the *first* of them had found shelter in those wild mountain glens, and that from time to time, one and another had been providentially added to their number. The evidence from which this account is taken, is that of their enemies, *the slave gazettes* of the island. They are accused of no crime, except the act of flying *from* oppression—*fabricated*, against all righteousness *into a crime*, by the *mischief-making* laws (Psalms xciv. 20—22.) of the nefarious slave-code. They seem to have lived soberly, industriously and affectionately together, hurting no one, *unknown to the world*, and all their wish, *to remain unknown*. They had cleared, of its heavy timber, and cultivated (part of it to great perfection,) about two hundred acres. They had "pigs and poultry," and were well supplied with clothing; for they sold or bartered their surplus productions, which were considerable, through their friends, amongst the slaves of the neighboring plantations; thus conducing to supply their vicinity with cheap and wholesome food. They had built a little village, containing a kind of council or meeting house of hewn cedar, and they called it "We no sen', you no come." The slave gazettes scoff at this title. To me, it is one of the most appropriate and affecting that my imagination could conceive. "We no sen', you no come"—as if they had said, "While we can remain concealed from you, white men, slave masters, you will not come like the hurricane, to sweep us to death—we know you, white men, slave masters; our only safety from you is concealment—if discovered, we are lost!" Such was the title which nature, writhing under recent outrage and with danger of death, growling all round, had taught them! How fearful and odious was the truth of the lesson!

In 1804, they *were* discovered. The white men came—their fields were destroyed—their village was burnt—and they were hunted to *death* or to bondage!!! Where is the man, with a man's heart, who would not have died with them, a thousand times rather than to have partaken of crowns of tyrant glory, or of mines of slaveholders' wealth, by aiding to verify the soul-moving title of their harmless hamlet, "We no sen', you no come."

NO. 3.

Sierra Leone has now (1835) been in operation nearly *fifty* years (from 1787.) It has been in a flourishing condition about *thirty* years. Prior to the formation of "*The African Institution*," in 1807, the *Sierra Leone*

Company had "ascertained the power of introducing agriculture, friendly commerce and freedom itself into Africa. It had shown that all the various natural products brought from the West Indies, might be raised on the African soil; that the native chiefs might be made to perceive the full interests of peaceful communication; and that negroes in a state of freedom, might be habituated to labor in the fields, and were capable of being governed by mild laws, without whips, tortures or chains to enforce submission to civil authority." Twenty years have elapsed, since the proof has been complete, that native Africans or negroes, do *not need* even an *hour's* drilling *by slavery*, to *prepare* them for *liberty;* since, from the moment, that they are landed from the slave ships, and placed under the protection and coercion of the equitable laws of the settlement, their behaviour has always been, as a body, singularly inoffensive, submissive and affectionate; and their industry, equal to any thing which could have been expected from any body of men in their circumstances. Of this, upwards of twenty thousand, are the living evidences. Nearly twenty years have elapsed, since they have had Christian missionaries amongst them, of the noblest stamp, who have lived and died for them, and some of whose services have been eminently blessed. And both the local and national governments have been full of *law and of regulation* and exertion against the African slave trade. Yet, it has been recently ascertained, that *Sierra Leone itself* has been (*clandestinely* indeed, yet to an extent almost incredible to those who have not explored the evidence) a *nursery* for the *African slave trade;* and it is a simple fact, of which none need be ignorant, that the *missionary* influence of Sierra Leone, upon *Africa*—Yes, *even* upon the *immediately adjoining districts* of Africa, up to this day, is next to nothing!!

What sanity then, is there in expecting that Liberia, or that any other, *not strictly speaking missionary* settlement on the coast of Africa, shall be of a higher character, or exercise a happier influence while slavery remains! except indeed there be sense in the colonization logic, viz. either, that transporting annually thousands or tens of thousands of "the most corrupt, depraved and abandoned people of the United States," as colonizationists call them, to Liberia, will civilize Africa!! *or*, that making a careful selection, from this reputed mass of corruption, for the sake of Africa, and consequently sending away only one in a hundred or less, the *whole* mass will be eventually removed, and thus disgorge the United States of the outraged class, which the color-phobiasts nauseate. This subject may afford edification perhaps to young moralists and mathematicians by being offered to their notice in the following form,

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE AT LEISURE HOURS.

1. How long will it take an individual or a nation to conquer prejudices, by continuing to practice and excuse them;—substituting general acknowledgements of their guilt, for immediately and thoroughly repudiating them?

2. How long will it take to *civilize* an uncultivated people, by deluging them, with myriads of the most corrupt, depraved and abandoned inhabitants of a civilized state?

3. How long will it take to christianize heathen nations, by sending the most corrupt, depraved and abandoned people of the United States, as missionaries to them?

4. If instruction be requisite in order to prepare the enslaved Americans for benefiting Africa; and if the slave laws, generally render their instruction impossible, while they remain slaves, how long will it take to prepare them, they remaining slaves?

5. How long will it take to remove between two and three millions of Americans to Africa, said to be the most corrupt as a body of all others, by making a careful selection *before* they are removed, and sending those *only*, who seem to be well qualified to benefit Africa?—or, in other words, how long will it take to clear away a forest of noxious plants, by removing *only*, the few healthful shrubs which adorn it?

6. How long will it take to remove to Africa, say, 2,500,000 Americans, with their annual increase of 60,000, by sending away a few hundreds or thousands yearly?—*or*, if a society remove 3000 Americans to Africa in ten years, how many years will it take the same society to remove 2,500,000 increasing annually at the rate of 60,000?

7. If, out of a vast multitude of corrupt depraved and abandoned people as they are reported, the few hundreds or thousands *only* are removed, who are really of a superior stamp, how will the separation be effected which is said to be indispensable to the prosperity of the United States?

8. If the good go, and the bad *only* remain, how will the United States be benefited?

9. If the bad *also*, who are said to be the vast majority, be sent to Africa, how will Africa be benefited?—or, can we sanely expect, that an uncivilized and heathen people will be disposed to deal with them more justly, or be able to manage them more easily, than the civilized and enlightened people of the United States?

10. If benevolence to Africa be our motive, *can* we send the *worst* part of our population thither?

11. If benevolence to ourselves be our motive, *can* we send away the

best of that *worst part*, leaving the *worst* without any *leaven of good*, to putrify and rankle amongst us?

12. If benevolence to that worst part, be our motive, *can* we send them away from our liberty, and our light, and our laws, and our power, and our benevolence, to a foreign uncivilized and heathen land?

13. If gratification of prejudice be our motive, how much better is it, to yield to prejudice than to crucify it?—to flatter, than to give it no quarter?

14. If it be true, that every sinner must repent or perish, what must be the fate of those who strive to put away the annoyance produced by an evil, without repenting of the sin which produces it?

AGAIN.

15. How long will it take to abolish the slave trade, while slavery, its always prolific source and its giant support, keeps up the demand for slaves.

16. What country has ever got rid of trading in slaves, prior to the abolition of slavery?

17. What country has ever abolished the *foreign* slave trade, without substituting an internal slave trade, and without continuing to traffic internally in slaves, as long as slavery lasted?

THE LAW

OF

PASSIVE OBEDIENCE;

OR

CHRISTIAN SUBMISSION TO PERSONAL INJURIES:

WHEREIN IS SHOWN, THAT THE SEVERAL TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE, WHICH COMMAND THE ENTIRE SUBMISSION OF SERVANTS OR SLAVES TO THEIR MASTERS, CANNOT AUTHORIZE THE LATTER TO EXACT AN INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, NOR, IN THE LEAST DEGREE, JUSTIFY THE CLAIMS OF MODERN SLAVEHOLDERS.

BY GRANVILLE SHARP.

"Servants, obey in all things (your) masters, according to the flesh; not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God;" &c.—Coloss. iii. 22.

PUBLISHED IN LONDON IN THE YEAR 1776.

THE

LAW OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.

The illegality of slavery among Christians is a point which I have long laboured to demonstrate, as being destructive of morality, and consequently dangerous both to body and soul. There are nevertheless some particular texts in the New Testament, which, in the opinion of several well meaning and disinterested persons, seem to afford some proof of the toleration of slavery among the primitive Christians; and, from thence, they are induced to conceive, *that Christianity doth not oblige its professors to renounce the practice of slaveholding.*

A learned and reverend correspondent of mine seems to have adopted this notion, and has signified his opinion nearly to the same effect, in a private letter to me on this subject, to which I have not yet ventured to send him a reply, though it is a considerable time since I received his letter; but, to say the truth, the question in which I had never before apprehended any difficulty, was rendered very serious and important, upon my hands, by my friend's declaration; and I thought myself bound to give it the strictest examination, because I conceived (as I do still) that the honour of the Holy Scriptures, which of all other things, I have most at heart, was concerned in the determination of the point in question; and yet I know, that my friend is full as zealous for the honour of the Scriptures as myself, and much more learned in them, being very eminent in that most essential branch of knowledge.

I believe also that he is perfectly disinterested, and of undoubted Christian benevolence. The objection has therefore acquired an accumulated weight from the authority and worth of the person who made it; and consequently, it demanded more circumspection and reading, to answer it in any reasonable time, than my short broken intervals of leisure (the only time that I was then master of) would permit me to bestow upon it; and as so much time has already elapsed, the answer which I originally intended for my friend's private perusal, shall now be addressed to all well meaning persons in general, who may have had the same motives for admitting in any degree the legality of slavery; and that there are many such (even among those that are concerned in the practice of slaveholding) the example of my disinterested friend's opinion, and common charity, oblige me to suppose. I shall therefore consider my friend's opinion as the common excuse of our American and West Indian brethren for tolerating slavery among them.

"I do not think (says he) that Christianity released slaves from the obligation they were under according to the custom and law of the countries, where it was propagated."

This objection to my general doctrine is expressed in the most guarded terms;—so guarded, that it obliges me to acknowledge, that the observation is, in some respects, strictly true. My present attempt is not to confute, but rather to demonstrate wherein this truth consists, which will afterwards enable me to point out such a due limitation of the doctrine, as will render it entirely inconsistent with the hypothesis, which I have so long laboured to maintain, viz: *the absolute illegality of slavery among Christians.*

In conformity to my worthy friend's declaration I must first observe, that the disciples of Christ (whose kingdom he himself declared—"is not of this world." John xviii. 36,) had no express commission to alter the temporal condition of men, but only to prepare them for a better world by the general doctrine of faith, hope, charity, peace and

good will, (or universal love and benevolence to all mankind) submission to injuries, dependence upon God, &c. which—though general doctrines—are amply and sufficiently efficacious indeed, for the particular reformation of all conditions of men, when sincerity is not wanting in the application of them; but the principal intention of the whole system is evidently to draw men from the cares and anxieties of this present life, to a better hope in the life to come, which is Christ's proper kingdom: Christian servants, therefore, were of course instructed to be patient, to be humble and submissive to their masters, "not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." So that even ill usage does not justify perverseness of behavior in Christian slaves.

The apostle Paul also frequently insists upon the absolute necessity of an unfeigned obedience in the behavior of Christian servants to their masters. "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it;" &c. 1 Cor. vii. 21. And again, "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart as unto Christ; not with eye service, as men pleasers, but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free," Ephes. vi. 5—8. Again, "Servants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God: and whatever you do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men." Colos. iii. 22, 23.—The same apostle instructs Timothy to recommend obedience to servants: "Let as many servants," says the apostle, "as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit.

These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions, and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil-surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness. From such withdraw thyself. But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content." 1 Tim. vi. 1—8. And again he insists on the same doctrine: "Exhort servants," says he, "to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things, not answering again, not purloining, but showing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things." Titus ii. 9, 10.

These texts are amply sufficient to prove the truth of my learned friend's assertion, so far as it relates to the duty of the slaves themselves, but this absolute submission required of Christian servants, by no means implies the legality of slaveholding on the part of their masters, which he seems to apprehend.

The slave violates no precepts of the gospel by his abject condition, provided that the same is involuntary (for if he can be made free, he is expressly commanded by the apostle to use it rather.) But how the master who enforces that involuntary servitude, can be said to act consistently with the Christian profession, is a question of a very different nature, which I propose to examine with all possible care and impartiality, being no otherwise interested in it than as a Christian who esteems both masters and slaves as brethren, and consequently, while he pities the unhappy temporal condition of the latter, is extremely anxious for the eternal welfare of the former.

I have already admitted, that *Christianity doth not release slaves* "from the obligation they were under according to the custom and law of the countries where it was propagated," agreeable to my learned friend's assertion, in

favor of which I have produced a variety of texts; but as "the reason of the law," (according to a maxim of the English law,) "is the life of the law," we cannot with justice draw any conclusion from thence, in favor of the master's claim, till we have examined the principles, on which the doctrine of submission, in these several texts, is founded; and we shall find, upon a general view of the whole, that the principal reason of enforcing the doctrine was not so much because the persons addressed were slaves, as because they were Christians, and were to overcome *evil* with *good*, to the *glory of God and religion*.

These principles are clearly expressed in several of these very texts, and implied in all of them, viz: "That the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." 1 Tim. vi. 1. And again, "That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior *in all things!* Titus ii. 10. So that a zeal for the glory of God, and of his religion (the principles of the first great commandment) is the apparent ground and sole purpose of the Christian slave's submission, which was therefore to be "with singleness of heart as unto Christ; not with eye service, as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free." Ephes. vi. 5—8. And again, the same apostle charges the servants among the Colossians, to obey "not as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God: and whatsoever they do, to do it heartily as unto the Lord, and not unto men." Coloss. iii. 2.

Thus it is plain that the service was to be performed "as to the Lord," and "not to men," and therefore it cannot be construed as an acknowledgment of any right, or property really vested in the master.—This will clearly appear upon a closer examination of some of these texts. In the first, for instance, though the apostle Peter enforces the necessity of the servants' submission to their masters, in the strongest manner, commanding them to be subject "not only to the good and gentle, but *also to the froward*,"

&c. (1 Pet. ii. 18,) yet he adds in the very next verse—"for this is thankworthy, if a man, *for conscience towards God*, endure grief, *suffering* WRONGFULLY;" so that, it is manifest, the apostle did not mean to justify the claim of the master, because he enjoined the same submission to the servants that suffered wrongfully, as to those who had good and gentle masters: and it would be highly injurious to the gospel of peace, to suppose it capable of authorizing wrongful sufferings, or of establishing a right or power in any rank of men whatever, to oppress others unjustly? And though the apostle Paul, also, so strongly exhorts servants to submit to their masters, and "to abide in the same calling wherein they were called," and "not care for it."—1 Cor. vii. 20, 21. Yet at the same time he clearly instructs them, that it is their duty to prefer a state of freedom whenever they can fairly and honestly obtain it; "but if thou mayest be made free," says he, "*use it rather!*" (v. 21.) And the reason which he assigns for this command, is as plainly delivered, viz: the equality of servants with their masters in the sight of the Almighty, "For he that is called of the Lord, being a SERVANT," says he, "is the Lord's FREEMAN: *likewise* also he that is called being *free*, is Christ's *servant*," (verse 22.) Christ having purchased all men to be his peculiar servants, or rather freemen.—"Ye are bought with a price," says the apostle in the 23d verse, "*be not ye the servants of man*," which plainly implies, that it is inconsistent with the dignity of a Christian who is the servant or freeman of God, to be held in an unlimited subjection, as the bond servant or slave of a *man;* and, consequently, that a toleration of slavery, in places where Christianity is established by law, is entirely illegal; for though *the slave* commits no crime by submitting to the involuntary service, (which has been already demonstrated,) yet the *Christian master* is guilty of a sort of sacrilege, by appropriating to himself, as an absolute property, that body, which peculiarly belongs to God by an inestimable purchase! For if God said of the Jews, even under the old law, (Levit. xxv. 52,) "They are my SERVANTS, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt;

THEY SHALL NOT BE SOLD AS BONDMEN."—How much more ought Christians to esteem their brethren, as the peculiar servants of God on account of their being freed from the more severe bondage of our spiritual enemy, (of which the Egyptian bondage was only a type) by the inestimable price of Christ's blood! and, surely, we may therefore say, "they are *God's servants*" whom Christ hath redeemed with his own blood, as much as the Jews of old, who were on that account expressly enfranchised from worldly bondage, "*they are my servants, they shall not be sold as bondmen;*" for this application of the text is entirely to the same effect as the apostle's expression to the Corinthians—"Ye are bought with a price, *be ye not the servants of men.*" 1 Cor. vii. 23. Dr. Whitby, indeed supposes that the words "ye are bought with a price," refer only to a pecuniary price given by the primitive Christians, to buy their brethren out of slavery. But the authority of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, which he cites, by no means proves his interpretation of the text, though it may sufficiently prove the primitive practice of redeeming slaves; which also furnishes a new argument against the legality of slavery among Christians, so far as the example of the primitive Christians is concerned. But scripture is best interpreted by scripture, and therefore the most certain means of ascertaining the true meaning of the words τιμης ηγορασθητε, "ye are bought with a price," is to have recourse to the very same expression (ηγορασθητε γαρ τιμης, the words being only transposed) in the preceding chapter 20th verse, where we shall find that it can refer to nothing less than the inestimable price of Christ's redemption: "What! know ye not," says the apostle, "that your *body* is the *temple of the Holy Ghost*, which is in you, which ye have of God, and *ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price:* therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's," (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20,) and, consequently, it is the duty of a Christian legislature to vindicate *the Lord's freemen* from *slavery*, as all mankind are included in the same inestimable purchase, for it is not only their souls but even

their bodies, which are God's;" and therefore it is an abominable sacrilege, that those bodies which are capable of being the "temple of the Holy Ghost," should be esteemed the mere chattels and private property of mercenary planters and merchants, merely for the sake of a little worldly gain!

But slaveholders may perhaps allege that believing masters are mentioned as "faithful and beloved," in one of the texts which I have cited, and are also expressly accounted as "partakers of the benefit," (see 1 Tim. vi. 2,) so that, from thence, they may perhaps infer, that slave keeping is not inconsistent with their Christian profession.

But these expressions are included in that part of the apostle's charge to Timothy, which relates merely to the instruction of servants, so that there is no room to suppose, that any reference was intended to the practice of the masters by way of justification.—The meaning therefore can amount to no more than this, viz: that as it is the duty of servants to "count their own masters"—even those that are unbelievers—"worthy of all honor,* that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed," so the same reason obliges them, more especially, to count their believing masters "worthy of all lawful honor," because of their Christian profession, which renders them accepted of God. For common charity obliges us, as Christians, to suppose that all men, who believe and hold the same professions as ourselves, are "faithful and beloved," as well as "partakers of the benefit" of Christ's redemption, because belief is the true means of leading and disposing men to acquire such happiness; and though many other necessary Christian qualities may seem wanting in our believing brethren, yet we must not presume to condemn them; God alone being their judge: and, for this reason also, Christian servants must not condemn and despise their believing masters, (though they know themselves equal in dignity as brethren, and that it is, consequently, their masters duty to

* Apparently meaning, "all honor" which is not inconsistent with their duty to God.

treat them as brethren) but must render them service the more willingly on this account, having brotherly love as an additional motive to faithful service. It is manifest, therefore, that this text was intended to regulate the conduct of Christian servants, and not that of Christian masters; for, with regard to the former, the doctrine is perfectly consistent with the other texts, that I have quoted; which is not the case when it is applied to justify the mere temporal claims of masters or slaveholders, because there are many clear and incontrovertible precepts throughout the New Testament for regulating the conduct of Christian masters, which exclude the justification of any such claims among Christians, and consequently forbid any application or interpretation of these particular texts in favor of them: and besides we must always remember, that it is not lawful to maintain an hypothesis upon the testimony of any one single text of doubtful interpretation, especially when the same does not clearly correspond with the rest of the Scriptures, and cannot bear the test "of the royal law," of which more shall be said in my tract "on the Law of Liberty."

I mention this text of St. Paul, as one of "doubtful interpretation," because commentators are divided concerning the application of the very words on which the imaginary justification of the slaveholder is supposed to be founded! Many learned men (and Dr. Hammond among the rest) have construed the words—"*ὁτι πιστοι εισιν και αγαπητοι, ὁι της ευεργεσιας αντιλαμβανομενοι*," (1 Tim. vi. 2.)* in a very different manner from the common version, and applied them to the servants, which entirely destroys the presumption in favor of the slaveholder.

Nevertheless I have contented myself with the common rendering, being convinced that no conclusions can fairly be drawn from this text in favor of slavery, even when the epithets "faithful and beloved," &c. are applied to the

* These words are translated by Dr. Hammond as follows:—"*Because they who help to do good are faithful and beloved*," and he uses several arguments to show that these epithets refer to the servants, rather than to the masters.

masters; because the signification of them must necessarily be restrained within the bounds of gospel doctrine; and, therefore, we cannot conceive that the apostle intended, by the application of these epithets, to justify any practices which are inconsistent with the benevolence enjoined in other parts of the New Testament; for this would be liable to produce a contrary effect from that which the apostle expressly intended by his injunction, viz: that "the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed."

Thus it appears, I hope, that the principles, on which the doctrine of the servant's submission is founded, are clearly expressed; so that slaveholders can have no right to avail themselves of any of these texts to enforce an *absolute submission;* for though these several texts clearly justify the slave, yet they cannot justify the master, unless he can show that the same principles, (or reason of the law) on which they are founded, hold good also on his side of the question.* Can the slaveholders and African

---

* This is apparently the case in the other "different relations of life, mentioned in these contexts," as in the relation between husbands and their wives, parents and their children, but is far otherwise in the relation between masters and their servants, (unless free hired servants are to be understood,) and therefore the objection of my learned friend, drawn from thence, cannot be just. He says, "If the connexion of persons in the two former respects be lawful, so that husbands had a right to the subjection of their wives, and wives a right to the love of their husbands; parents had a right to the honour and obedience of their children, and children a right to maintenance and instruction by their parents; unnatural (says he) is it to imagine the connection between master and slaves was looked upon by him as absolutely unlawful, so that the former had no right to rule the latter! Indeed, he very clearly signifies (says he) that the right of dominion remained, when he opposes *doing wrong* to *obeying in all things their masters according to the flesh*, &c. as he does. Coloss. iii. 25." "Ὁ δε αδικων κομιειται ὁ ηδικησεν."

But my learned friend has entirely misunderstood the purport and intention of my arguments on these several texts relating to obedience and submission. I have not attempted to prove, by these particular expressions of the apostle, that "the connection

traders allege, for instance, that they shall "adorn the doctrine of God our Savior," (Titus ii. 10,) by persisting

---

between masters and slaves "was looked upon by him as absolutely unlawful, so that the former had no right to rule the latter;" for this I have demonstrated, I trust, by other authorities of scripture equally authentic, and much less liable to be misunderstood. My attempt to explain the texts in question extends no further than to show that they do not really justify the uncharitable claims of the modern slaveholders, though they are frequently cited for that purpose.

An attempt to show that any particular doctrine is *not necessarily implied* in a certain text or texts of scripture, is a very different thing from an attempt to *prove* or *authenticate an opposite doctrine* by the same text of scripture! For instance, when my learned friend asserts, as above, that the apostle to the Colossians, iii. 25, "very clearly signifies that the right of dominion remained, when he opposes *doing wrong* to *obeying* in all things their masters." &c. I do not pretend to build an opposite doctrine upon the very same words, but shall only endeavour to show that this supposed "right of dominion" is not necessarily implied in the text which my friend has cited in support of it.

The servants are indeed expressly and plainly exhorted to obedience and submission, as well in this as in all the other texts before recited, so that a contrary behavior in them might certainly be esteemed a "doing wrong" on their part, yet this by no means implies "a right of dominion" vested in the master; for that would prove too much; because the like submission is elsewhere equally enjoined to those who are expressly said to "endure grief, *suffering wrongfully*," and we cannot suppose (as I have before observed) that the submission enjoined implies a right in masters to exercise such a dominion as that of oppressing others *unjustly*, for that could not possibly tend to promote the declared purposes of the apostle's exhortations, viz: "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed," (1 Tim. vi.) And again, "that they may adorn the doctrine of God in all things," (Titus ii. 9.) These purposes, however, are fully answered in the advice given by the same apostle to all the other different relations of life mentioned by my worthy friend. Wives may "adorn the doctrine of God" by submission to their "own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord." (See Coloss. iii. 18.) And husbands by love to their wives: for they are expressly charged in the following verse "not to be bitter against them," that is, they must, by love and sincere affection, moderate and soften that supreme authority with which husbands are entrusted, (by the laws of God and man,) that they may rule rather by the gentle influence of an inviolable love and fidelity, as so good an

in their unnatural pretensions to an absolute property in their poor brethren? or that they "do the will of God

---

example will seldom fail to produce due respect, and will certainly "adorn the doctrine" or profession of the Christian. Children "may adorn the doctrine of God" by obedience to their "parents in all things for this is well-pleasing," says the text, "unto the Lord." (v. 20.) And again, the reciprocal duty of fathers is plainly pointed out to be a prudent moderation of that paternal authority with which they are entrusted, for they are carefully warned against arbitrary severity. "Provoke not," says the apostle, "your children to anger, lest they be discouraged." Servants are in the very next verse (v. 22) commanded to "obey in all things their masters according to the flesh, not with eye-service, as *men pleasers*, but in singleness of heart, *fearing God*:" so that the *submission* of the servants was also to adorn the "doctrine of God," it being manifestly enjoined only for God's sake, and not on account of any supposed "*right of dominion*" invested in the masters, which the following verses (v. 23 and 24,) when applied to *the servants*, sufficiently demonstrate—"And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and *not unto men:* knowing, that of the Lord ye shall receive *the reward of the inheritance:* for *ye serve the Lord Christ.*" And to the same eternal and unerring dispenser of rewards—and not to temporal masters—is attributed the power of punishing the "doing wrong," mentioned in the very next verse; which according to my learned friend's notion, is opposed to obeying in all things the masters—"he that *doeth wrong*," says the text. "shall receive for *the wrong* which he hath done; and *there is no respect of persons.*" (v. 25.)

Such strict impartiality in the administration of justice cannot always be attributed, with certainty, even to the best regulated human tribunal, and much less is it applicable to the decisions of uncontrolled will and pleasure, in punishing "wrong doing," under the absolute dominion of slaveholders! No earthly dominion whatever is conducted with such an equal distribution of rewards and punishments, as that it may always with truth be said, "there is no respect of persons," for this is the proper characteristic of the judgments and dominion of God and Christ alone. "For the Lord is *judge*, and with him is *no respect of persons.*" Eccles. xxxv. 12. "For there is *no respect of persons* with God." Rom. ii. 11. And, therefore, we may fairly conclude that the punishment, not only of *slaves*, but that also of *masters*, that "do wrong," is to be understood in the text which my friend has cited to support his notion of a "right of dominion" vested in the masters; so that the said supposed right has, indeed, but a very "slippery" foundation! Agreeable to my last remark on this text, (Coloss. iii. 24,)

from the heart," (Ephes. vi. v, &c.) when they retain their neighbor in an involuntary, unrewarded servitude for

---

the learned Dr. Whitby has commented upon it, as if he thought it exactly parallel to another declaration of the same apostle, (viz. Ephes. vi. 8 and 9,) wherein not only both masters and servants are unquestionably included, but also the dominion, or judgment, in which "there is no respect of persons," is expressly attributed to our "Master in heaven." "Christ, in judging men at the last day," says the Doctor, "will have no respect to the quality or external condition of any man's person; but, *whether he be bond or free*, he shall receive recompense for the good that he hath done, in obedience to him; whether he be master or servant, he shall be punished for the wrong that he doeth in those relations."

If all these circumstances be duly considered, it will manifestly appear, I trust, the master's supposed "right of dominion"—which certainly is not expressed in the text—cannot even be implied in these contexts, nor in any of the parallel passages already recited! Can the master adorn the 'doctrine of God our Savior"—as in the other indissoluble relations of life—by continuing the unnatural connection of master and slave, and by exacting involuntary labor from his brethren without wages or reward, agreeable to my friend's notions of the supposed implied "right of dominion!" The reciprocal duty of the master is mentioned, indeed, in the next chapter, (Col. iv. 1,) but it is of such a nature as must necessarily lead Christian masters to abhor any such supposed "right of dominion" as that which is tolerated in the British colonies, and which my friend seems desirous to defend! The masters are not directed by the apostle to claim as their own, by "right of dominion," the labor of their servants *without wages*, but, on the contrary, are expressly commanded to "*give* unto their servants that which is *just* and *equal;* which comprehends (as I have fully shown in the preceding tract) such a measure of generosity, recompense, and benevolence, on the part of the master as is totally inconsistent with the claims and views of modern slaveholders! and, if put in practice, would necessarily effect the entire abolition of slavery!

The masters are likewise carefully reminded, in the last mentioned text, that they "also have a Master in heaven."—(Col. iv. 1.) A Master, by whose example they are bound to regulate their conduct, so that this consideration alone is a sufficient antidote against slavery; for the principal doctrine of that heavenly Master was LOVE, which cannot subsist with the contrary exaction of involuntary servitude! "This is my commandment," said that glorious and gracious Master, "That ye LOVE one another AS I have *loved* you." The nature of his love (which we are to imitate, that is, to *love* as he hath *loved* us) is then immediately described as exceed-

life? If they can do this, I shall have reason to be silent. But if, on the contrary, it should evidently appear that a very different behavior is required of Christian masters, "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed," (1 Tim. vi. 1,) they must be obliged to allow

---

ing all bounds of comparison: "Greater love," said he "hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his *friends*.—Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." "*Henceforth I call you not servants.*" Here is an express enfranchisement of his servants for our example! The universal Lord and Master of all men delights in promoting the dignity of human nature; which cannot be said of the temporal slaveholder, who enforces an imaginary "right of dominion" by exacting an involuntary service, and that for no other purpose than for the sake of a little pecuniary gain, by depriving the laborer of his hire; which savors of no other love but self-love; whereas, our disinterested Lord and Master hath even laid down his life through love and compassion to his *servants*, and hath declared us free, as before recited. "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant," said he, "knoweth not what his Lord doeth; but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." John xv. 12—15. And, in the 17th verse he again enforces his doctrine of *love*. "These things, I command you," said he "that ye love one another." The measure of this indispensable love is expressly declared in the Scriptures, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself*. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore *love* is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. xiii. 9 and 10.

Such *love*, therefore, is clearly incompatible with the arbitrary claims of the slaveholder, who can neither be said to love his neighbor as himself, nor to cherish that love which worketh no ill to his neighbor, whilst he strenuously contends for such "a right of dominion" as may enable him to exact not only the involuntary service of his neighbors and brethren, contrary to the law of nature, but also to rob them of the fruits of their own labors, "Giving them not for their work;" against which practices a severe denunciation of *woe* is expressly declared in the Scriptures; as I have fully demonstrated in my tract on "the Law of Retribution" as well as in the preceding tract: and, therefore, as it is necessary to construe difficult or dubious passages of Scripture consistently with the general tenor of Scripture evidence, it would be highly improper to admit this opposite doctrine of a supposed "*right of dominion*," especially as the same is not expressed in the text which my learned friend has cited for it, but is merely drawn forth by an imaginary implication!

that the "reason or life of the law" is against them; and, consequently, that none of these texts, relating to Christian servants, are capable of affording them the least excuse for their selfish pretensions. They will find also, upon a more careful examination of the scripture, that they themselves are as much bound by the gospel to bear personal injuries with patience and humility, as their slaves. Because the benevolent principles of the gospel of peace require all men, freemen as well as slaves, to return "good for evil." "Bless them that *curse* you," said our Lord, "and *pray* for them which *despitefully use you.* And unto him that *smiteth* thee on the one cheek, offer also the other; and him that *taketh away* thy cloak, forbid him not to take thy coat also," &c. Luke vi. 28, 29. But, though submission and placability are thus unquestionably enjoined to the sufferers in all the cases above recited in the text, yet surely no reasonable man will pretend to allege, from thence, that tyrants and oppressors have thereby obtained a legal right, under the gospel, to curse others, and use them despitefully; or that the unjust oppression of strikers and robbers is thereby authorized or justified! In the same light exactly must we view the slaveholders claim of private property in the persons of men, whenever an attempt is made to support it on the foundation of any such texts as I have quoted, wherein servants or slaves are exhorted to submit with passive obedience, &c. to their masters; because the right (as it is improperly called) or pretension of the master may with the greatest propriety be compared to the pretended right or authority of oppressing or robbing others, which is too often exercised by imperial tyrants and despotic princes, as well as by their brethren in iniquity of a lower class, viz: pirates, highwaymen, and extortioners of every degree! The gospel of peace cannot authorize the oppression of these lawless men, though it clearly enjoins patience, submission, and acquiescence, to the individuals that are injured, whether freemen or slaves! The placability and absolute submission, commanded by the last cited text, to Christians in general, are manifestly founded on the very same princi-

ples with that particular submission which the gospel requires of Christian slaves; and is further parallel to the latter, by being equally passive; so that the oppression of the slaveholder can no more be justified by any text of the New Testament, that I am able to find, than the oppression of the striker and robber.

Unhappily for the Christian world, the duties of patience, submission, and placability, enjoined by the gospel to persons injured, are too commonly either misunderstood or rejected; though the temporal, as well as the eternal, happiness of mankind greatly depends upon a conscientious and proper observance of these duties: for even the most rigid obedience to the letter of the command would be far from being productive, either of the real evils to which the pernicious doctrine of a national passive obedience apparently tends, or of the imaginary inconveniences apprehended by the advocates for duelling, because the same benevolent principles, (viz: universal love and charity, founded on the great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,") which oblige the true Christian, most disinterestedly, to forgive all injuries, and pass over every affront offered to his own person, will necessarily engage him, on the other hand, as disinterestedly, to oppose every degree of oppression and injustice, which affects his brethren and neighbors, when he has a fair opportunity of assisting them; and from hence arises the zeal of good men for just and equitable laws, as being the most effectual means of preserving the peace and happiness of the community, by curbing the insolence and violence of wicked men. We have an eminent example of this loyal zeal in the behavior of the apostle Paul, who could not brook an infringement of the Roman liberty from any persons whatever in the administration of government, though he could endure personal injuries from men unconnected therewith, and the persecutions of the multitude, with all the Christian patience and meekness which the gospel requires. The scripture history of this great apostle affords many proofs of his extraordinary humility and patience under sufferings, so that his spirited opposition to

the illegal proceedings of magistrates cannot be attributed to private resentment on his own account, but merely to his zeal for the public good, founded upon the great Christian principle of "loving his neighbor as himself," since the maintaining of good laws is, certainly, the most effectual means of promoting the welfare and happiness of society. His resolute and free censure of the magistrates at Philippi, in the message which he sent by their own serjeants,* his spirited remonstrance to the chief captain at Jerusalem,† and his severe rebuke to the high priest himself, even on the seat of judgment,‡ are remarkable instances of this observation.

---

* "And, when it was day, the magistrates sent the serjeants, saying, Let those men go. And the keeper of the prison told this, saying to Paul, The magistrates have sent to let you go: now therefore depart, and go in peace. But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast (us) into prison: and now do they thrust us out privily! nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out. And the serjeants told these words unto the magistrates: and they feared when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought them out, and desired them to depart out of the city." Acts xvi. 35—39.

† "The chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging; that he might know wherefore they cried so against him.—And, as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard (that) he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born. Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain was also afraid after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him. On the morrow, because he would have known the certainty wherefore he was accused of the Jews, he loosed him from (his) bands, and commanded the chief priests and all their council to appear, and brought Paul down and set him before them." Acts xxii. 24—30.

‡ "And Paul earnestly beholding the council, said, Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this

In the last mentioned instance, indeed, the apostle was charged, by those "that stood by," with reviling God's high priest, which would have been a notorious breach of the law, had there not been circumstances of justification sufficient to vindicate the severity of the apostle's censure: these, however, were not urged by the apostle himself, who best knew how to behave towards those with whom he had to do. He readily allowed the principle, however, on which the censure of his accusers was founded, but he by no means retracted what he had so justly applied to the person of the unworthy magistrate who sat to judge him; neither did he even acknowledge him to be the high priest, though he was expressly questioned for a supposed misbehavior to that dignitary! His answer was cautiously worded. He did not say—I know not that this person, whom I have censured, was the high priest, but—*ουκ ηδειν, αδελφοι, οτι εστιν αρχιερευς*, &c. "I knew not, brethren, that there is a high priest."* Which answer, though on the first hearsay it seems to bear some affinity to an excuse or apology for what had past, yet in reality, includes a still farther rebuke; for it plainly implies that the high priest, in whose presence the apostle then stood, was (in some respect or other) deficient or blameable in his deportment as chief magistrate, either that he did not duly support the dignity of that sacred and distinguishing public character, so that he did not seem to be high priest, and of course could not be known and honored as such; or else that his be-

---

day. And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth. Then Paul said unto him, God shall smite thee, (thou) *whited wall;* for, sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law? And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God's high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest, for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people. Acts xxiii. 1—5.

* The learned Hugh Broughton has construed the text as follows—"I knew not, brethren, that there was a high priest;" but the words *ουκ ηδειν, αδελφοι, οτι εστιν αρχιερευς*, are more literally rendered above. Castalio reads it—"*Nesciebam, fratres, esse pontificem.* And Heinsius—"*Summum esse sacerdotem ignorabam.*"

havior had been so unjust and illegal that he did not deserve to be considered as a lawful magistrate, who had publicly demeaned himself as a tyrant, by commanding a prisoner to be beaten contrary to law, without hearing his defence! And, that this latter sense is most probable, we may learn by the following circumstance, viz: that the apostle chose to decline the dispute, and to waive the accusation about reviling the high priest, by acknowledging the principle of law on which it was manifestly founded, viz: "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." But be pleased to observe, he neither acknowledged that he himself had broken the said precept by so severely censuring the unjust ruler, nor did he acknowledge the presence of a high priest in the person of Ananias; neither did he allow the bystanders time enough to criticise upon the true literal meaning of his reply, (whereby they would probably have been led to demand some express recantation of the personal censure which he had so amply bestowed upon the high priest,) but he prudently changed the subject in debate from the *person* of the high priest (who was a zealous overbearing *Sadducee*) to an avowed censure of his whole sect, charging the Sadducees in particular with the unjust persecution, then before the assembly, and openly appealing to the opposite party, the Pharisees, in order to divide his united enemies: "I am a *Pharisee*," said he, "the son of a *Pharisee;* of the hope and resurrection of the dead I *am called in question.*" Such a manifest reflection against the whole body of Sadducees cannot by any means favor the supposition of an intended apology, or recantation in the preceding sentence, to soothe the enraged leader of that very party, whom he had publicly branded as a hypocrite, with the significant appellation of *whited wall!* Let it be also remembered that the supposed breach of the precept ("thou shalt not speak evil of the *ruler* of thy people") could not rest on the circumstance of *knowing Ananias to be the high priest;* for, whether the apostle did know, or did not know that Ananias was high priest, yet he certainly knew, before he censured him, that he was a ruler of the people, and that he then sat in

the quality of a judge; (for this is declared in the very censure itself—"sittest thou to *judge me* after the law, and commandest me to be smitten *contrary to law!*") so that whether Ananias was really high priest, or not, he was manifestly censured in his official capacity as a ruler, or magistrate, and not as a private individual, through any inadvertency or mistake of the apostle, as some commentators have conceived. And, even when the apostle was informed by those "that stood by," that the magistrate whom he had censured was the high priest, ("revilest thou God's high priest?") Yet his reply, ("I knew not, brethren, that there is a high priest,") when fairly compared with the preceding censure of Ananias, as an unjust dispenser of God's law, ("sittest thou to judge me according to law?" &c.) proves, as I before remarked, that the apostle neither acknowledged the dignity of a high priest, nor that of a legal ruler in the person of Ananias, though he knew him at the same time *to be a ruler*, and had censured him as such, for having notoriously prostituted the power and authority of a ruler, and violated the law, by commanding him to be stricken contrary to law, notwithstanding, that he sat to judge (as the apostle remarked) "according to the law;" in which case no epithet whatever could be so apt and expressive to mark the true character of the dignified hypocrite in power, as *whited wall!* This proves, that the apostle knew well enough with whom he had to do. The censure was too just, and his prophecy in the accomplishment too true, ("God shall smite thee, thou *whited wall*,")* to be esteemed a mere unguarded sally of resentment! The latter supposition is, indeed, inconsistent with the remarkable sagacity, prudence, and readiness of mind, which always distinguished this apostle in bearing his testimony to the truth, on the most dangerous

* This denunciation of God's vengeance against Ananias was fully justified by the event; for, Josephus (as the learned Monsieur Martin remarks) reports that he was killed in Jerusalem with his brother Ezechias. "*Josephe rapporte*," liv. 2. *de la guerre des Juifs, qu'il fut massacre dans Jerusalem avec son frere Ezechias.*"

emergencies! The apostle's known character as a chosen vessel for Christ's service, and as an exemplary preacher of righteousness, will by no means permit us to conceive that he was either guilty of any mistake or inadvertency with respect to the person of the high priest on this occasion; or of any illegal or unbecoming behavior to him as a ruler or judge of the people! When these several circumstances are compared with the general bad character of Ananias,* as a persecuting zealot of the most virulent and intolerant sect among the Jews, it must appear that the apostle accounted that person unworthy of any esteem as a magistrate, whom he had so publicly convicted of abusing and perverting the legal authority with which he had been entrusted; and, indeed, a notorious breach of the law, by any man in the capacity of a ruler, may reasonably be esteemed a temporary disqualification for such an honorable trust; for, a judge without justice and righteousness, who openly perverts judgment, does thereby unquestionably degrade himself from the dignity of his station, and render himself unworthy, for the time being, of that respect which is otherwise due to his rank in office. The same apostle, indeed, upon another occasion, commands us to give "honor to whom honor" is due; but what honor can be due to a convicted hypocrite—a "whited wall"—a "wolf in sheep's clothing"—to an "Ananias on the seat of judgment?" *Such* characters must expect *such* treatment, as Ananias met with, from all sensible and discerning men; if the latter are also equally loyal with the apostle, I mean in the strict and proper sense of the word *loyal*, (which is so frequently misapplied and perverted by sycophants,) that is, if they are equally zealous with that apostle for law, justice, and righteous-

† This malicious Sadducee very soon afterwards gave so flagrant a proof of his injustice and cruelty towards the Christians, that even the Jewish historian, Josephus, has recorded it as an event which gave offence to all good and loyal men at that time in Jerusalem; I mean the murder of the apostle James, bishop of Jerusalem, whom Josephus stiles the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ.

ness, for the general good of mankind! So that if we approve of the apostle's advice, in the beginning of the same sentence, viz: "*Rendering, therefore, unto all their dues*"—"tribute, unto whom tribute,—"custom to whom custom"—"*fear* to whom *fear*"—"*honor* to whom *honor*;" we must needs also allow, that the apostle's practice (even in his behaviour to Ananias) was strictly consistent with his own declared precepts, and that he most justly rendered to Ananias *his due*, when he so severely reprimanded his conduct as a judge! When all these circumstances are duly considered, the meaning of the apostle's reply, may, fairly enough, be paraphrased in the words of Lorinus,*

---

* "*Nesciebam eum esse pontificem, quia, ex modo loquendi furioso, non videtur esse pontifex, sed tyrannus.*" Many of the most learned and celebrated commentators have considered the apostle's censure nearly in the same light. In the learned commentary, commonly called Assembly's Annotations, the same sense is applied to the apostle's reply to the charge of having reviled God's high priest, viz: "I know him not to be a lawful high priest, *who thus violateth the law;* and, indeed," (says the Commentary,) "he was but an usurper." For proof of which they refer us to "Josephus, Ant. I. 20. c. 3. 5. Chr. Helvic. Theat. Hist. Anno Christi, 46."

The learned Mathias Flacius Francowitz remarks that the famous Augustine, bishop of Hippo, thought this reply of the apostle *ironical.* "and truly," says he, "it borders upon irony; for when he saw him (Ananias) sit in the chief place among the priests, to judge according to the law, he necessarily knew him to be the high priest: for even the little children knew that by his mere pomp and attendants; and much less could a man, so watchful and diligent as Paul, be ignorant of it; the sense, therefore, is," says the learned Francowitz, "I do not acknowledge, in this man, the high priest of God, but a hypocrite, a deceiver, and a persecutor of the truth. Otherwise, I well know that a ruler is not to be spoken against or reviled." To the same effect, also, the learned Monsieur Martin—"As St. Paul," says he, "was not ignorant, nor could be ignorant that this was the high priest, especially as he saw him at the head of the sanhedrim, it is better to translate the term of the original, by *I did not think*, &c. as in Mark ix. 5. and so to understand this reply of St. Paul as a grave and strong irony, by which he would make those understand, by whom he was accused of want of respect for the high priest, that this person was a man unworthy of that character, and that he did not believe, that a vicious and wicked man, such as Ananias, who had usurped

as I find him quoted by Cornelius a Lapide, viz: "I knew not that he was the high priest, because, from his furious manner of speaking, he did not seem to be *a high priest*, but a *tyrant*." This sense is strictly consonant to reason and natural right!

Justice and righteousness are so inseparably connected with the proper character of a *chief magistrate* or *ruler*, that any notorious perversion of those necessary principles in the actual exercise of that official power with which a magistrate is entrusted for legal (and not for illegal) purposes, must unavoidably distinguish the contemptible hypocrite, *the whited wall*, from the honorable *magistrate*, and deprive the former of the respect which is due only to the latter! "Sittest thou to judge me *according to the law*, and commandedest me to be smitten *contrary to law?*" Thus the apostle clearly explained the fitness and propriety of the reproachful figure of speech (whited wall,) by which he had expressed the true character of the unworthy judge!

An appellation similar to this was given, even by our Lord himself, to the Scribes and Pharisees, who were the teachers and magistrates of the people: "Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which, indeed, appear beautiful outwardly, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." Matt. xxiii. 27.—And, in the context, he calls them "blind guides," (v. 24,)—"hypocrites," (v. 25,) "full of hypocrisy and iniquity," (v. 28,)—"partakers in

---

the pontificate by purchasing it of the Romans, could deserve to be esteemed as the high priest of God!"

It would be tedious to quote all the authorities that may be found to this purpose; the evidence, however, of the learned Dr. Whitby, as it includes more authorities than his own, is worthy of the reader's notice. "Dr. Lightfoot and Grotius," says he, "think as I do, that St. Paul does not go about to excuse his mistake, but rather saith, I know well enough that God's high priest is not to be reviled, but that this Ananias is a high priest, I know not, i. e. I do not own him as such who hath procured this title by bribery; our celebrated Rabbins having declared that such an one is neither a judge, nor to be honored as such," &c.

the blood of the prophets," (v. 30.)—" serpents,"—" generation of vipers,"—" how can he escape the damnation of hell?" &c. (v. 33.) Nay, Herod himself, the tetrarch of Galilee, was not exempted from the severity of our Lord's censure, when there was a proper occasion to declare it; for, though our Lord lived, for the most part, under Herod's temporal jurisdiction, that is, in Galilee, yet he openly, characterised the crafty, base, and self-interested, disposition of the tetrarch, by expressly calling him a fox,*

* " The message, our Lord here sends to Herod," (says a sensible and learned commentator, the Rev. Mr. Francis Fox, in his edition of the New Testament, with references set under the text in words at length,) " is no breach of that command which forbids the speaking evil of the ruler of the people, and consequently is no blemish (says he) in our Lord's example. For our Lord here acts as a prophet, as one who had received an extraordinary commission from God: and those, who were truly prophets, were, in the execution of their commission, above the greatest men and most powerful princes, whom they were not to spare when God sent them to reprove for sin." All this is certainly true with respect to the real authority of Christ to censure Herod, and that his applying so harsh and severe an expression to the tetrarch " is no blemish in our Lord's example:" but yet this is not, I apprehend, the proper method of reconciling the seeming difficulty, which arises from this example, of our Lord's applying a severe and reproachful epithet to a chief ruler, (in calling Herod a fox,) when it is compared with that precept of the law, which forbids the speaking evil of the ruler of the people; for, though our Lord had ample superiority and authority to reprove whomsoever he pleased, even the greatest ruler upon earth, yet, with respect to his own personal behaviour, as a man among men, he claimed no authority to dispense with the positive precepts of the Mosaic law, on account of his own real dignity, or superiority over the rest of mankind, but strictly obeyed the law in all things, and publicly declared his strict conformity thereto. " Think not," (said he,) " that I come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Matth. v. 17.

" By the law and the prophets" (says the same ingenious commentator above cited) " are meant the great rules of life, delivered in the writings of Moses and the prophets, or in the Old Testament, more especially the duties of the moral or natural law;" (from whence those, respecting our behavior to rulers, cannot with propriety be excluded;) " These, our Lord assures us, he did not come to destroy or dissolve: It was not his design to free men from the obligation they were under to practise the moral laws of God, but

"Go ye, and tell that fox," &c. Luke xiii. 32, and, though our Lord endured the most provoking indignities from the licentious soldiery and reviling multitude, in silence, answering not a word, agreeable to that striking character of a suffering Messiah, so minutely described, many ages before, by the prophet Isaiah,* yet ye made an apparent distinction between the violence and injustice of these, as individuals, and the injustice of man in a public character, as a chief magistrate; for even in our Lord's state of extreme humiliation, when his hour of sufferings was come, he did not fail to rebuke the injustice of the high priest in his judicial capacity, because, instead of proceeding against him by the legal method of examination by witnesses, he had attempted to draw out matter of accusation from his own mouth, against himself, by interrogatories, according to the baneful method of arbitrary courts!

But our Lord soon put a stop to his imperitent questions, by referring him to the legal method of finding evidence by witnesses:—Why askest thou me? Ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said." John xviii. 21. Upon which, a time-serv-

---

to fulfil and perfect them. This our Lord did, by living up to those laws himself," (which totally excludes the idea of his dispensing, on account of his own real superiority, with that moral law respecting behaviour to rulers,) "and becoming thereby an example to us, by freeing them from the corrupt glosses, which the teachers among the Jews put upon them, and by expounding them in their fullest sense, and according to their just latitude, shewing that they command not only an outward obedience, but the obedience even of the mind and thoughts, as appears in what our Lord delivers in the following verses:—These laws have their foundation in the reason and nature of things, and therefore their obligations will never cease."

* "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter; and, as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was taken from prison, and from judgement: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken! Isaiah liii. 7, 8.

ing, officer, who probably had not accustomed himself to distinguish the different degrees of respect that are due to good and bad magistrates, "gave Jesus a blow, or rap with a rod," (εδωκε ῥαπισμα τω Ιησου)saying, "Answerest thou the high priest so?" (v. 22,) which open injustice, to a person uncondemned, (even while he stood in the presence of the magistrate, who ought to have protected him,) drew a farther remonstrance, even from the meekest and humblest man that ever was on earth, though the same divine person afterwards suffered much greater indignities in silence! For, "Jesus answered him,"—"If I have spoken evil," said he, "bear witness of the evil: but, if well, why smitest thou me?" (v. 23.)

This showed that the reprehension of magistrates and and their officers, for injustice and abuse of power, is not inconsistent with the strictest rules of Christian *passive obedience;* and, though the apostle Paul, in a similar case, used much harsher language, yet his censure was undoubtedly just and true, and the severity of his expressions was plainly justified (as I have already shown) by the event! i. e. by the fatal catastrophe of *Ananias.* The law, therefore, which forbids the speaking evil of the ruler of the people, is certainly to be understood with proper exceptions, so as not to exclude any just censure of rulers, when their abuse of office, and the cause of truth and justice, may render such censure expedient and seasonable. That the apostle Paul thus understood the text in question, is manifest from his manner of quoting it, when he was charged with reviling God's high priest, if the severity of his censure be compared with the indifference which he showed, immediately afterwards, towards the offended Sadducee, by openly professing himself to he of an opposite party, and by throwing an oblique charge against the whole body of Sadducees, as the principal authors of the unjust persecution against himself,—"I am a *Pharisee,*" (said he,) "the son of a *Phasieee;* of the hope and resurrection of the dead am I called in question." (Acts xxiii, 6.) Thus he manifestly threw the whole blame upon the

Sadducees, and thereby showed no inclination to apologize for the severity of his speech to their dignified chief!

I must further remark, that the apostle's behavior, in openly opposing the high priest, (who, as such, was also a chief magistrate and judge,) is by no means inconsistent with that excellent advice which the same apostle has laid down in the thirteenth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, though it is frequently cited by the advocates for arbitrary power, in order to justify their false notions concerning the necessity of absolute submission and entire passive obedience?

To an inattentive reader, indeed, the apostle's expression may seem too much to favour such doctrines, if the sense and connexion of the whole context are not carefully weighed together: but though he said—"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they, that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation." Yet he immediately afterwards signifies what kind of rulers he spoke of "that were not to be resisted." "For *rulers*" (says he, in the very next verse,) "*are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.* Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is *good*, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the *minister* of *God* to thee for *good*." (But *Ananias*, as a ruler, was certainly the very reverse of this description, so that the practice of the apostle with respect to him, was by no means opposite to this doctrine.) "But" (says he) "if thou do that which is *evil*, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is *the minister of God*, a revenger to (execute) wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore (ye) must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also *for conscience sake.* For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are *God's ministers*, attending continually upon this very thing. Render, therefore, to all their dues: tribute, to whom tribute (is due;) custom, to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom

honor." (Romans xiii. 1 to 7.) Now, be pleased to remark, that the apostle has expressly and repeatedly assigned the reason why so much respect and obedience is due to the higher powers, or to the ruler, or magistrate; "for he is" (says the apostle) "the *minister of God to thee for good*," &c.; and again—"for he is the *minister of God*, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil:" and again—"*for they are God's ministers;*" that is, they are God's ministers while they maintain justice and righteousness in the execution of their public charge, howsoever deficient their characters may be in other respects, as private individuals; but, on the other hand, such an unjust ruler as Ananias, for instance, who sat to judge *according to law*, and yet commanded a person to be beaten *contrary to law*, such a ruler, I say, cannot be esteemed a minister of God to us *for good*, or a minister of God in any respect whatsoever. A man, who is notoriously guilty of perverting the laws, and of abusing the delegated power, with which he is entrusted, by acts of violence and injustice, is so far from being "the minister of God," that he is manifestly "the minister of the devil;" which is the express doctrine of the common law of this kingdom, according to the most approved and most ancient authorities; wherein we find it applied not merely to inferior rulers, but to the supreme magistrate, even to the king himself,* if he rules contrary

* The celebrated and learned Henry de Bracton says,—"that a king can do nothing else upon earth, as he is *the minister* and *vicar of God*, but that only which *by law* he may do," &c. And, a little further, he adds,—"His power, therefore," (says he) "is of right, (or law,) and not of wrong, (or injury,) &c."—"That a king ought, therefore, to exercise the power of right, (or *law*,) as *the vicar and minister of God* on earth, because that power is of God alone; but the power of wrong (or injury) is of the devil, and not of God, and the work of which soever of these the king shall do, of him he is the minister whose work he shall do. While, therefore, he does justice, he is the vicar (or minister) of the eternal king; but he is the minister of the devil while he turns aside to injustice, for he is called king (rex) from well ruling, and not from reigning; because he is king while he rules well, but a tyrant while he oppresses the people committed to his charge with violent (or op-

to law, by violating, corrupting, or perverting, in any respect, the powers of government! And that excellent constitutional lawyer, Lord Sommers, informs us, that St. Edward's law even goes further,* viz: "That, unless the king performs his duty, and answers the end for which he was constituted, not so much as the name of a king shall remain in him." Now, when these constitutional principles of the English law are collated and duly compared with the precepts before cited from the apostle Paul, they are so far from being contradictory, that the full and clear meaning of them all may be maintained together without the least inconsistency or discrepance of doctrine; for we may surely say, with the apostle, "Render to all their dues," &c. without seeming to favour the pernicious and dangerous doctrine of an unlimited passive obedience! "Render, therefore, to all their dues; tribute, to whom tribute (is due); custom, to whom custom; fear, to whom fear; honor, to whom honor."—For, though custom, tribute, fear, and honor, are certainly due to him who is the minister of God to us for good, yet, surely, no honor is due, or ought to be rendered, to the minister of the devil, to the perjured violator of a public trust, who, in the eye of the English law, is not even worthy of "so much as the name of a king!"

Fear, indeed, may too often be said to be due to such

pressive) government." "Nihil enim aliad potest rex in terris, cum sit Dei minister et vicarius, nisi id solum quod de jure potest, &c. Potestas itaque sua juris est, et non injuriæ, &c. Exercere igitur debet rex potestatem juris, ficut Dei vicarius et minister in terra, quia illa potestas solius Dei est, potestas autem injuriæ diaboli, non Dei; et cujus horum opera fecerit rex, ejus minister erit, cujus opera fecerit. Igitur dum facit justitiam, vicarius est regis æterni; minister autem diaboli, dum declinet ad injuriam. Dicitur enim rex a bene regendo et non a regnando, quia rex est dum bene regit, tyrannus dum populum sibi creditum violenta opprimit dominatione." Henrici de Bracton de Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliæ lib. iii. c. ix. And nearly the same doctrine in substance is laid down in Fleta, lib. i. c. 17.

* The judgment of whole kingdoms and nations, concerning the rights, power, and prerogative, of kings, and the rights, privileges, and properties, of the people, &c. See the 51st paragraph.

men when in power; but it is a very different sort of fear from that reverential fear which is due to him who "is the minister of God to us for good!" It is such a fear only as that, which men have of a wild beast that devours the flock! He is fierce and strong, say they, and, therefore, each individual, through fear of personal inconvenience to himself, is induced to wink at the ruinous depredations made upon his neighbors and brethren, so that, for want of a prudent and timely opposition, the voracious animal (which in a state is a many headed monster) becomes stronger and more dangerous to the community at large, till the unwary time-servers themselves perceive (when it is too late) that, by their own selfish connivance, respectively, as individuals, they have been accessaries to the general ruin; and, as such, must one day be answerable to God for their shameful breach of that law of liberty,* ("Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,") in which we are assured all the law is fulfilled,† and by which we are also assured, we shall be judged!‡

This heavenly principle is the true and proper ground for patriotism, and undoubtedly has always been the predominant motive of great and good men, (such as the disinterested and loyal apostle Paul, following his Lord's example,) in their opposition to the injustice of rulers and magistrates, though they passively submit to personal injuries from other hands! for, in this, as I have already remarked, consists the due distinction between the necessary Christian submission to personal injuries, and the doctrine of an unlimited passive obedience.

The subjection and obedience to magistrates, enjoined by the same apostle in his Epistle to Titus, (c. iii. 1,) must certainly be understood with the same necessary limitations,—"Put them in mind," says the apostle, "to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates,"

---

* See my tract on the Law of Liberty.

† "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Galatians, v. 14.

‡ "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James ii. 12.

(πειθαρχειν, says he, but then he immediately subjoins,) "to be ready to every good work."—and no man can be esteemed "ready to every good work," if he is obedient to magistrates when their commands exceed the due limits of the law; or if (contrary to the example of the apostle himself) he neglects a fair opportunity of publicly discountenancing and censuring any notorious perversion of justice and right by a magistrate!

The same necessary limitation of the doctrine of obedience must also be understood when we read the exhortation of another apostle on this head, viz: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. "For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using (your) liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God!" (1 Peter ii. 13—16.) Governors are here declared to be sent for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well; to such, therefore, as answer this description, the submission and honor enjoined in the context are undoubtedly due; but, whenever the governors themselves become the evil doers, and, like Ananias, instead of praising and encouraging "them to do well," do notoriously abuse, oppress, and murder them, as he did,* it would be a manifest per-

* The apostle Paul was so far from retracting any part of his severe censure and remonstrance against Ananias, that he afterwards (before Felix) defied Ananias and the rest of his accusers to show that he had been guilty of any the least misdemeanor ever since his last arrival at Jerusalem, and more particularly while "he stood before the council," (meaning the time when he foretold that God should smite that whited wall, Ananias,) "or else" (said he to Felix) "let these same here say," (meaning the high priest Ananias, the elders, and their orator, Tertullus, mentioned in the first verse of the chapter,) "if they have found any evil doing in me while I stood before the council, except it be for this one voice," (now he once more provokes the malicious Sadducee,) "that I cried, standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." (Acts xxiv. 20.) This is a manifest

version of the text to suppose that we are required thereby to "submit ourselves to every ordinance of man,"* without admitting such just and necessary exceptions to

declaration that there was nothing reprehensible either in his behavior or words on that day "before the council," because his declaration concerning the resurrection of the dead was the only one voice (or expression) which he supposed these Sadducees could call in question and lay to his charge!

* The apostles and disciples of Christ were so far "from submiting themselves to every ordinance of man," that they boldly rejected the unjust commands even of the high priest and the whole national council of the Jewish state! The great council, called *Sanhedrim*, i. e. *συνεδριον*, (the commands of which they rejected,) included at that time all persons of their nation that bore any public authority or dignity among them, for the text expressly informs us that "their rulers, and elders, and scribes, and Annas, the high priest," (and the high priests since the time of the Maccabees were generally considered as a sort of princes,) "and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, were gathered together at Jerusalem."

No power, therefore, amongst the Jews, could be more respectable (in regard to temporal authority) than this great national council: and the apostle Peter accordingly acknowledged their legal authority at first, by respectfully addressing them, saying,—"Ye rulers of the people and elders of Israel," &c.

Yet, notwitstanding the temporal authority of this awful assembly of rulers and elders, (or senators,) they were publicly disregarded and contradicted by the apostles even in their presence, upon the very first proposal of an unreasonable and unlawful ordinance; for "they called them," (the apostles,) "and commanded them not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus."—But "Peter and John answered and said unto them, whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." (Acts iv. 19 and 20.) And afterwards, when they were brought a second time before the said great council to answer for their breach of this "ordinance of man," "the high priest asked them, saying, did not, we straightly command you that you should not teach in this name, and behold ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. Then Peter and the other Apostle answered and said,—We ought to obey God rather than men," &c. This sentence, in effect, holds good with respect also to the rejection of every public ordinance that is contrary to reason, justice, or natural equity, as well as those that are contrary to the written word of God! This I have shown more at large in my declaration of the people's right.

the doctrine as I have already cited from the example of the apostle Paul, and even from that of our Lord himself.

And, therefore, though the apostle Peter adds,—"Honor all (men): love the brotherhood: fear God: honor "the king:" yet he must necessarily be understood to mean, with the apostle Paul, that we must render "honor to whom honor" is *due*, and not to honor such men and such kings as are unworthy of honor!*

* To the example of the patriotic apostle, Paul, upon this point, I must now add that of another chosen vessel of Christ, the proto-martyr Stephen: this excellent man, "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," (Acts vi. 3,) "full of faith and power," (v. 8,) "and whose wisdom and spirit none were able to resist:" (v. 10,)—This excellent man, I say, has left us by his own example an unquestionable precedent on record to demonstrate that honour is not due to the highest temporal authority on earth, not even to a great national council of rulers and elders, while they exercise their authority in unjust prosecutions, and abuse their power by enacting unreasonable and tyrannical ordinances. The great council of the Jewish state had been "straightly commanded" the apostles and disciples of Christ (as I have already remarked in a preceding note) "not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus;" which command, it seems, was given lest their preaching should "bring this man's blood" (said the high priest, meaning the blood of our Lord Jesus) "upon us:" but Stephen paid so little regard either to the unlawful command itself, or to the reason of it, that he afterwards publicly upbraided the whole council, with the high priest at the head of it, (in the most stimulating and unreserved terms,) as the betrayers and murderers of the just One!—"Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears," (said he to their faces in the public assembly,) "ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers (did,) so (do) ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the just One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers," &c. (Acts vii. 51 and 52.) Words could not well be sharper than these, which is manifest from their effect; for the text testifies that "when they heard these things they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with (their) teeth." (v. 54.) Thus it clearly appears that the holy, innocent and meek Stephen did not think himself bound (like our undistinguishing passive-obedience men) to "submit to every ordinance of man," &c. nor to "honor all men," without making reasonable and due exceptions! Nay, so far from honoring men merely on account of their temporal dignity, it is manifest that he treated the whole body of rulers with the utmost severity and contempt, while he thought them unworthy of honor,

But what men (it will be said) are to be esteemed the proper judges of desert in such cases, so as to determine with propriety when honor is or is not to be rendered? To which I answer—Every man is a judge of it if he be not an idiot or mad man! Every man of common sense can distinguish justice from injustice, right from wrong, honorable from dishonorable, whenever he happens to be an eye or ear witness of the proper circumstances of evidence for such a judgment! Every man, (except as above,) be he ever so poor and mean with respect to his rank in this life, inherits the knowledge of good and evil, or reason, from the common parents of mankind, and is thereby rendered answerable to God for all his actions, and answerable to man for many of them!

In this hereditary knowledge, and in the proper use of it, (according to the different stations of life in which men subsist in this world,) consists the equality of all mankind in the sight of God, and also in the eye of the law, I mean the common law and rules of natural justice, which are formed upon the self-evident conclusions of human reason, and are the necessary result of the above mentioned hereditary knowledge in man. Every man knows, by what we call conscience, (which is only an effect of human reason upon the mind,) whether his own actions deserve the censure of the magistrate, who "bears not the sword in vain!" And the same principle of hereditary knowledge enables him to judge also concerning the outward actions of other men, whether they be just or unjust; whether they be praiseworthy or censurable!

But, if a man abuses his own natural reason, and suffers himself to be blinded by private interest, by passion, or unreasonable resentment, or by pride, envy, or personal partiality, and is thereby led to misconstrue the actions of his superiors, to behave unseemly towards them, and to censure them publicly without a just cause, the conscience of such an offender against reason will speedily

---

and yet there is no doubt but that he most conscientiously, on every occasion, rendered "honor to whom honor" was due!

inform him that he has cause to fear the magistrate, and that he is liable to suffer for his misbehavior "as an evil doer:" but, when the like faults are discoverable on the other side, that is, on the side of the superior or magistrate, (as it happened in the case of Ananias,) a just censure of the unjust magistrate, even though it comes from the poorest and meanest man that happens to be present, will have its due weight in the opinion of all unprejudiced and disinterested persons, and may occasion a considerable check to the progress of injustice; and, therefore, if any man neglects such an opportunity (when he has it in his power) of making a personal protest (as Paul did) against the public injustice of a wicked magistrate, he strengthens the hand of iniquity by his timidity and remissness, and becomes accessary to the public disgrace by refusing his endeavors, according to his abilities, (howsoever small,) to vindicate the laws of God, and maintain the common rights of his neighbors and brethren. Such an one unhappily demonstrates that he has more fear of man than of God, and much more love for himself than he has for his neighbor and country, and, consequently, in that awful day, when he "shall be judged by the law of liberty,"* must be liable, (unless a timely repentance should have previously restored him to a better use of that hereditary knowledge for which all men are accountable,) must be liable, I say, to be cast with the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth!" Matt. xxv. 30.

All men, therefore, be they ever so rich, or ever so poor and mean, are required to vindicate the cause of truth, justice, and righteousness, whenever they have a favourable opportunity of doing so; they are required, I say, because they are enabled by their natural knowledge of good and evil to discern and judge concerning the fitness or unfitness of human actions, and of the justice or injustice of all measures and proceedings that happen to fall within the reach of their inspection and consequent obser-

* James ii. 12. See also my tract on the law of liberty.

vation. He, who denies this, is ignorant of the true dignity of human nature, and wants a teacher to point out to him not only the equality of mankind before God, but also the universal conditions of man's subsistence in the world! The hereditary knowledge of good and evil may. at least, be esteemed as the one talent for which all mankind are accountable to the universal Lord? And, therefore, if they wilfully abuse or bury this talent, they have surely nothing to expect but the condemnation above mentioned of the unprofitable servant!

Shall we blame the patriotic apostle, then, for his zeal in vindicating the natural rights of mankind against an unjust judge, when he had so fair an opportunity of protesting against his iniquity? God forbid! Let us, on the contrary, revere his example, which, in reality, affords no opposition to the doctrine laid down in the beginning of this tract concerning the necessity of "Christian submission to personal injuries." If he, sometimes, freely and courageously expressed his resentment for personal ill usage, it was always in vindication of the law, on which (next to the providence of God) the safety, liberty, and happiness, of the community depend; whereas, the hasty revenger of his own cause is so far from being a friend to the community, or a lover of liberty, that he himself is actually a tyrant; because he neglects the necessary doctrine of "Christian submission to personal injuries," and on every occasion is ready to revenge his own cause with his own hand, and to usurp all the distinct offices of judge, jury, and executioner! He is so far from vindicating the law, like the generous and patriotic apostle, for the sake of national liberty, that he manifestly sets himself up above the law, (which is the first characteristic of a tyrant,) and thereby renders himself in fact an open enemy to liberty, and consequently a disgrace to society!

GRANVILLE SHARP.

"*Glory* to *God* in the highest!
And on Earth—*Peace*,
Good will towards men!"

AN EXTRACT

FROM

THE LAW OF RETRIBUTION.

BY GRANVILLE SHARP.

Published in 1776.

THE African slave trade has been publicly supported and encouraged by the Legislature of this kingdom for near a century last past; so that the monstrous destruction of the human species which is annually occasioned thereby, may certainly be esteemed a national crime of the most aggravating kind, which (according to the usual course of God's Providence in the world) will probably draw down some exemplary vengeance upon the unrepenting inhabitants of this island! And, with respect to the British colonies the uncharitable practice of slave-holding, especially in the West-India Islands and the more Southern Colonies, is grown up into a more enormous and destructive oppression (whether we view the prodigious multitudes of the oppressed, or the unconscionable severity of the oppresors) than perhaps ever disgraced any other nation at any one period of time!

The several attempts that have lately been made to justify these two branches of abominable national iniquity by the Holy Scriptures, and especially by the permission

therein granted to the Israelites to purchase and retain slaves among them, have induced me to collect, from the history of the Jews in several books of Holy Scripture, some plain examples of God's vengeance upon that particular nation, expressly for this kind of oppression; which, I hope, will sufficiently prove that slavery was ever detestable in the sight of God, and consequently that a speedy reformation is absolutely necessary, as well with respect to the African slave trade, encouraged in this kingdom, as the toleration of slavery in the British American dominions, if we mean to entertain the least hope of escaping a severe national retribution, which, if we may judge by our present civil dissentions and horrid mutual slaughters of national brethren, seem ready to burst upon us!

I am well aware, indeed, how very unfashionable it is, now-a-days, to quote Scripture, when matters of law, politics, or trade are called in question; yet I flatter myself that the following examples, drawn from thence, are perfectly suitable to my present point, and consequently must have weight to convince all persons, who sincerely acknowledge the truth of the Scriptures, that we have the greatest reason to apprehend the infliction of some heavy judgment from Almighty God upon these kingdoms, on account of the monstrous load of guilt which the British subjects, on each side of the Atlantic have incurred by the oppressions above mentioned.

In some former tracts I have already shown that the servitude which the Jews, by the Mosaic Law, were permitted to exact of their brethren, even when the latter were *sold* to them, was very much limited; that they were not to be treated as *bond servants*, (Levit. xxv. 39, 40.) but as *hired servants*; that the *servitude* could not lawfully be extended beyond *seven years* (Exod. xxi. 2.) unless the servant loved *his master* and condition, and voluntarily demanded (Exod. xxi. 5, 6,) of him to be continued in his service; and that, in every other case, it was absolutely unlawful to hold a brother Hebrew in slavery.

I have likewise shown, that, under the glorious dispensation of the gospel, we are absolutely bound to consider

ourselves as citizens of the world; that every man whatever, without any partial distinction of nation, distance, or complexion, must necessarily be esteemed our neighbor, and our brother; and that we are absolutely bound in Christian duty to entertain a disposition towards all mankind as charitable and benevolent, at least, as that which was required of the Jews, under the law, towards their national brethren; and, consequently, that it is absolutely unlawful for those, who call themselves Christians, to exact of their brethren (I mean their brethren of the universe) a more burthensome service than that to which the Jews were limited with respect to their brethren of the house of Israel; and the slavery, or involutary bondage, of a brother Israelite was absolutely forbid.

These premises naturally lead us to consider the severe national judgments which the Jews brought upon themselves principally by exceeding these very limitations which I have here specified; and the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from these examples is, that we are absolutely in danger of the like judgments, if we do not immediately put a stop to all similar oppression by national authority: because an uncharitable extension of the said limits, by those who call themselves Christians, will certainly be, at least, as heinous in the sight of God as the oppression of brethren under the law; and probably much more so, if we consider the purity and benevolence which is required of all men under the gospel dispensation: and I have clearly proved (I trust) that the permission to the Israelites, to keep bondmen of the heathen (or more properly the nations, הגוים) that were round about them, and of "the children of the strangers that dwelt among them," cannot be extended to any other people, whatever, except the Israelites themselves; and that even to them it was only temporary, during the dispensation of the Mosaic Law, whilst they possessed the land of Canaan, the former inhabitants of which (viz. the seven abominable nations of Palestine, expressly mentioned by name in the seventh chapter of Deuteronomy, where the sameHeb. noun גוים, rendered heathen in the former text, is properly expressed by the En-

glish word nations) the Israelites were expressly directed to drive out, kill, and destroy without pity (Deut. vii. 16,) and to make no covenant with them (Deut. vii. 2.) : and I hope I have also proved that the remainder of these particular wicked nations, thus expressly doomed to destruction, were undoubtedly " the heathen" (or nations) " that dwelt round about" the Israelites, and " the children of the strangers" whom (and whom alone) it was lawful to hold in perpetual bondage ; for otherwise that permission cannot be reconciled to God's positive commands, given in the same law, to love the stranger. " The Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which regardeth not persons" (so that this was apparently a general law, or rule, of conduct, towards all persons, except the people of those particular nations which were expressly, by name, condemned to destruction by the hands of the Israelites, in other parts of the law, for their abominable wickedness) " nor taketh reward : he doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. LOVE YE THEREFORE the stranger," (and the almighty inculcates a sympathetic concern for the welfare and happiness of strangers, by reminding the Israelites of their own unhappy situation formerly in a strange country,) " for ye" (says the text,) " were strangers in the land of Egypt." Deut. x. 17 to 19. See also Levit. xix. 33, 34. " Thou shalt love him," that is (the stranger,) " as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

National wickedness, from the beginning of the world, has generally been visited with national punishments : and surely no national wickedness can be more heinous in the sight of God, than a public toleration of slavery and oppression ! for tyranny, (in whatsoever shape it appears,) must necessarily be esteemed a presumptuous breach of that divine command, in which " all law is fulfilled" (Gal. v. 14.) viz. " Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Levit. xix. 18.

The histories of all nations, indeed afford tremendous examples of God's vengeance against tyrants ; but no his-

tory is so proper to illustrate this subject, (which now so nearly concerns us, as that of the Jews: for as the knowledge of the divine law was revealed in a more particular manner to that people, and to others only through them, so the effect even of their disobedience was an exemplary demonstration, from time to time, of God's vengeance, as well as of his mercy, for the instruction of all other nations, amongst whom they are now dispersed as living monuments of the same to this very day: and we have the authority of an apostle (Cor. x. 11,) to assert, that "all these things happened unto them for examples; and they are written," (says he) "for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come."

One of the first and most signal instances of mercy which the Almighty was pleased to show that people, after they became a nation, was, the restoring them to their natural freedom from the deplorable slavery in which they were detained by a tyranical Egyptian monarch (Exod. iii. 23, 24,): and the tremendous judgments whereby this deliverance was effected (viz. the plagues of Egypt) are so many signal examples of God's severe vengeance against slaveholders, which ought to be had in everlasting remembrance, to warn all nations of the world against the unnatural and baneful practice of keeping slaves.

This deliverance from bondage was frequently mentioned, even in the words of God himself, by his prophets, from time to time (as I have before remarked)—"Thus saith the Lord" (i. e. Jehovah) "God of Israel: I brought you up from Egypt, and brought you forth out of the house of bondage;" (מבית עבדים, more literally "from the house of slaves") "and I delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of all that oppressed you," &c. Judges vi. 8.—"I removed his shoulder from the burden; his hands were delivered from the pots:* thou calledst in trouble, and I delivered thee." Psal. lxxxi. 6, 7.

The Israelites themselves were also particularly direct-

*In like manner there are multitudes of poor people retained in a deplorable bondage, even to this day, in the potteries of China.

ed to remember this signal exertion of divine mercy and power in the cause of popular freedom: "Remember that thou wast a servant" (viz. a slave) "in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm," &c. Deut. v. 15.

It was surely for the moral purpose of stirring up in the Israelites a sympathetic concern for the sufferings of the oppressed, and more particularly of oppressed strangers, that they were so frequently reminded of their own former deplorable condition in slavery, and of their miraculous deliverance from thence; being expressly referred to their own feelings and remembrance of the cruel foreign tyranny, which they themselves had so lately experienced in Egypt:— "thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye *know the heart*" (נפש, properly *the soul*) "*of a stranger*, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. Exod. xxiii. 9.

God also gave the Israelites due warning of the danger of oppression, by declaring that he would *surely* revenge the cause of the injured stranger: "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will *surely* hear their cry" (mark this ye African traders of this island, and ye West India and British American slave holders! for ye are all guilty of the like abominable oppressions, and God will *surely* avenge the cause of the oppressed) "and my wrath shall wax hot and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless." Exod. xxii. 21 to 24.

And have not the careless inhabitants of Great Britain and her colonies too much reason also to apprehend that the same God (who professes to hear the cry of oppressed strangers, if they cry at all unto him) will, sooner or later, visit these kingdoms with some signal mark of his displeasure, for the notorious oppression of an almost innumerable multitude of poor African strangers, that are harrass-

ed, and continually wearing out, with a most shameful involuntary servitude in the British colonies! nay, and that by a public toleration, under the sanction of laws to which the monarchs of England, from time to time, by the advice of their privy counsellors, have given the *royal assent*, and thereby rendered themselves parties in the oppression, and (it is to be feared) partakers of the guilt!

Let us not forget, before it is too late, that the Almighty has not only declared himself ready to "*hear the cry*" of the oppressed stranger, but hath deigned to add to his glorious name Jehovah, a brief remembrance of his merciful interposition in behalf of an enslaved nation: "I am the Lord your God" (or Jehovah your God, said the Almighty to the Israelites) "which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Exod. xx. 1. Thus the Almighty Deliverer from slavery vouchsafed to set his own divine example before the eyes of his redeemed people, to excite benevolence and thankfulness; and the like remembrance of that glorious redemption from slavery was very frequently repeated from time to time; which the Scriptures sufficiently testify: but alas! the Israelites profited so little by these wholesome lessons, that it became necessary, no less frequently, to remind them of the dreadful vengeance which would inevitably overtake them for their notorious oppressions of the poor; for their unjust exactions of involuntary and unrewarded service; and for exceeding the limitations of bondage (already recited)which the law expressly enjoined!

"For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the Lord; and will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him," or "that would ensnare him." Psal. xii. 5.

The princely prophet Isaiah plainly declared to them, that their public fasts and outward humiliations were not only vain, but even offensive to God, while such notorious oppressions continued among them, "Behold" (said he) "in the day of your fast, you find pleasure, and exact all your labors." lviii. 3. And again,—"Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul? is

it to bow down his head as a bulrush?" &c. "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burthens" (or rather the bundles of the yoke, אגדות מוטה plainly referring to the severe and unjust bondage of the poor) "and *to let the oppressed go free*, and that *ye break every yoke*!"—"Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and to bring the poor that are cast out" (or rather to bring the poor that are reduced, or depressed, viz. as it were by tyrants; for so the word מרודים seems more properly to signify in this place) "to thy house?" &c. Compare this with Deut. xxiii. 15, 16. And he warned them of the divine justice that would pursue them for their oppression and tyrannical treatment of the poor.

"The Lord standeth up to plead, and standeth to judge the people! The Lord will enter into judgment with the ancients (or senators) of his people, and the princes thereof; for ye have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses! What mean ye that you beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor?" saith the Lord of hosts! Isa. iii. 13 to 15.

The wicked practices whereby the Israelites reduced their poor brethren to slavery are described by the prophet Amos: "Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, when will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the Ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? That we may buy the poor for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes" (that is, comparatively speaking, at a most contemptible price! whereby we may presume that slave markets were not so notoriously established at that time as at the present; and that the bidders were few, though the oppressed were many) "yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat? The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, surely I will never forget any of these works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein?" &c. Amos viii. 4 to 8.

Here is a solemn appeal from God to the human under-

standing: "Shall not the land tremble for this!" that is, for this same abominable oppression of the poor (the buying them for slaves) in which Great Britain and her Colonies are infinitely more guilty than the people to whom this appeal was made! and "shall not the land" (therefore) "even our land, tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein?" &c. Surely "God will never forget any of these works," my countrymen!

The prophet Jeremiah manifestly alluded to the like deceitful practices of the Jews (whereby they reduced the poor to slavery) when he made a solemn protest against them in the name of God:—"Your sins" (said he) "have withholden good things from you. For among my people are found wicked (men): they lay wait as he that setteh snares; they set a trap, they catch men. As a cage (or coup) is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit: therefore they are become great, and waxen rich. They are waxen fat, they shine: yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked; they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, yet they prosper; and the right of the needy do they not judge. Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord! Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" &c. Jer. v. 26 to 29. Here again the Almighty plainly appeals to the human understanding concerning the propriety or rather the necessity, of exerting the divine vengeance against such an oppressive nation.

And yet how inconsiderable was the crime of the Jewish nation in this respect, if compared with the numerous bondage and with the unbounded oppsession of the poor negroes in the British colonies? Have we not therefore just reason to fear that God will "visit for these things?" Does not the word of God, which cannot change, appeal to us, my countrymen, as well as to the Jews?—"Shall not my soul" (saith the Lord!) "be avenged on such a nation as this?"

The same prophet, in the next chapter, declares the divine vengeance to be at hand:—"For thus hath the Lord of hosts said,—Hew ye down trees, and cast a mount against Jerusalem. This (is) the city to be visited! she

is wholly oppression in the midst of her. As a fountain casteth out her waters, so she casteth out her wickedness; violence and spoil is heard in her; before me continually is grief and wounds! Be thou instructed, O Jerusalem! lest my soul depart from thee: lest I make thee desolate, a land not inhabited!" Jer. vi. 6 to 8.

But in vain were the warnings of the prophet, till the judgments themselves began to appear in all the horrors of a hopeless war, which began in the ninth year (Kings xxv. 1.) of King Zedekiah's reign, notwithstanding that the monarch had previously rendered himself secure (as he thought) by his military preparations (in sending for horses and men from Egypt to complete his standing army) and had also made Pharaoh (another presumptuous military tyrant) his ally, which encouraged him to break his oath and covenant with the king of Babylon.

But "when Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon, and all his army, and all the kingdoms of the earth, of his dominion, and all the people, fought against Jerusalem, and against all the cities thereof"—then God ordered his prophet to remind Zedekiah of that dreadful vengeance, defeat and captivity, which had so often before been denounced as the necessary consequences of oppression and injustice!—"Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel" (viz. to Jeremiah): "Go, and speak to Zedekiah King of Judah, and tell him, thus saith the Lord; behold I will give this city into the hand of the king of Babylon; and he shall burn it with fire. And thou shalt not escape out of his hand, but shall surely be taken, and delivered into his hand; and thine eyes shall behold the eyes of the King of Babylon, and he shall speak with thee mouth to mouth, and thou shalt go to Babylon," &c. Jer. xxxiv. 1 to 3.

The impending vengeance being then become visible, and consequently more tremendous, by the near approach of the Babylonian army, that irresistible instrument in the hand of God, by which the Jews had so often been subdued, the king's stubborn heart began to relent, and his military confidence to forsake him, which had before encouraged his injustice; his firmness in worldly politics was sha-

ken, and yielded to a sense of guilt! It was upon this return of conscience and right reason that Zedekiah sent two messengers, Passur and Zephaniah, to Jeremiah, saying, "Inquire, I pray thee, of the Lord for us; for Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon maketh war against us! if so be the Lord will deal with us according to all his wondrous works, that he may go up from us," &c. See chap. xxi. ver. 1 and 2. But a very unwelcome answer was given to the messengers, to be returned to their monarch; for the prophet confirmed all the heavy judgments (Jer. xxi. 3 to 7.) which had before been denounced, as well against the king, expressly by name as against the city and its iniquitous inhabitants, whose notorious oppressions were now to be recompensed upon their own heads, measure for measure:—"Now is the end come upon thee, and I will send mine anger upon thee, and will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense upon thee all thine abominations," &c. Ezek. vii. 3. See also the 4th, 8th, and 9th verses, to the same effect. And afterwards, in the 11th verse, one of the principal causes of God's vengeance is mentioned:—"Violence" (said the prophet) "is risen up into a rod of wickedness: none of them shall remain, nor of their multitude, nor of any of their's; neither shall their be wailing for them. The time is come, the day draweth near!" &c.—And again, in the 23d verse:—"Make a chain" (said the prophet); for the land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence. Wherefore I will bring the wor t of the heathen, and they shall possess their houses," &c.—"Destruction cometh; and they shall seek peace, and their shall be none. Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumor shall be upon rumor," &c.—"The king shall mourn, and the prince shall be clothed with desolation, and the hands of the people of the land shall be troubled: I will do unto them after their (own) way, and according to their deserts" (or rather their own judgments) "will I judge them; and they shall know that I am the Lord." Again, in the 12th chapter, the same reason is clearly assigned for the pouring out of God's vengeance:—"Say unto the people of the land,

thus saith the Lord God of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and of the land of Israel; they shall eat their bread with carefulness; and drink their water with astonishment, that her land may be desolate from all that is therein, because of the violence of them that dwell therein." Ezek. xii. 19. The nature of this baneful violence, which occasioned their destruction, is more particularly described by the same prophet, in chap. xxii. ver. 7.—"in the midst of thee" (still speaking of Jerusalem) "have they dealt by oppression with the stranger" (mark this ye British slave dealers and slaveholders); "in thee have they vexed the fatherless and the widow. Thou hast despised mine holy things, and hast profaned my Sabbaths. In thee are men that carry tales to shed blood: and in thee they eat upon the mountains: in the midst of thee they commit lewdness," &c.—"One hath committed abomination with his neighbour's wife: and another hath lewdly defiled his daughter-in-law," &c. "In thee have they taken gifts to shed blood: thou hast taken usury and increase, and thou hast greedily gained of thy neighbors by extortion, and hast forgotton me, saith the Lord God. Behold, therefore, I have smitten mine hand at thy dishonest gain which thou hast made, and at thy blood which hath been in the midst of thee," &c. Ezek. xxii. 7, &c.

Oh that the subjects of the British empire would seriously compare these crimes with their own practices! they would then, surely, be sensible of their danger; and that they have reason to expect the like, or rather much heavier, judgments, than those denounced against the Jews! For, besides the notorious adulteries, and other acts of lewdness, which many amongst us (from the frequency of such crime) commit, even without shame or remorse, we have far exceeded the guilt of the Jews, I fear, in many of the other points also which provoked the vengeance of the Almighty against them! What "violence" amongst the Jews, before their captivity, was ever "risen up into" so destructive "a rod of wickedness"—as the African slave trade, now carried on chiefly by our Liverpool and Bristol merchants? What "bloody crime" among the

Jews was more notorious, and more wickedly premeditated, than the late invasion and conquest of the poor innocent Carribees at St. Vincent's? And what nation hath "dealt by oppression with the stranger" so generally, so inhumanly, and in so great a degree, as our British American slaveholders!—Have we not ample reason to expect that the same tremendous decree will, in God's justice, be fulfilled upon these kingdoms?—"Destruction cometh: and they shall seek peace, and there shall be none. Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumor upon rumor," &c. &c. &c.—"I will do unto them after their (own) way, and according to their (own) judgments will I judge them!" &c.

Nevertheless, God was pleased to offer the Jews a choice in their fate,—either to forsake their wicked King (who had forfeited all right to govern, by his neglect of justice and natural right) and to fall away to the king's enemies, the Chaldeans; or else to perish miserably in the city, and partake of its destruction!—"And unto this people" (said God to the prophet Jeremiah) "thou shalt say, thus saith the Lord; behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death. He that abideth in this city shall die by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence: but he that goeth out, and falleth to the Chaldeans that besiege you, he shall live, and his life shall be unto him for a prey," &c. Jer. xxi. 8, 9.

The prophet, however was directed to add to his message a word of advice to the king and court, which shows that a seasonable repentance might, even then, have saved the state, and turned away the impending vengeance.

It was such advice, too, as every other monarch, who tolerates any unnatural bondage or oppression in his dominions, ought seriously to consider, because the event proved it to be the best means of averting God's anger, if the king had but persevered in it.—"And touching the house of the king of Judah" (continued the prophet) "say,—hear ye the word of the Lord, O house of David—thus saith the Lord; execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go

out like fire, and burn that none can quench (it), because of the evil of your doings." Jer. xxi. 12. This is a manifest declaration that the neglect of justice and right, and the toleration of oppression, were the principal causes of God's heavy vengeance against that royal house!

The same advice was, by God's command, repeated by the prophet to the king himself in his palace (see the next chapter):—"Thus saith the Lord; go down to the house of the king of Judah, and speak there this word, and say, hear the word of the Lord, O king of Judah, that sittest upon the throne of David, thou, and thy servants, and thy people that enter in by these gates" (that is, all persons whatever that enter in by the palace gates, plainly including the whole court, before whom the prophet was to deliver his message): "Thus saith the Lord; execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor; and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger,"* &c.—"For if ye do this thing indeed" (that is, if ye will execute judgement and righteousness, deliver the oppressed, &c.) "then shall there enter in by the gates of this house kings sitting upon the throne of David" (or rather "that sit," i. e. reign, "for David upon his throne") "riding in chariots and on horses, he and his servants, and his people" (that is, the court should continue and prosper.) "But if ye will not hear these words, I swear by myself, saith the Lord" (i. e. Jehovah) that this house" (i. e. the palace) "shall become a desolation." Jer. xxii. 1 to 5. So that the whole court were as much interested to promote a speedy reformation, as the king himself. Thus it is plain that the king and court had also a choice given them of life and death, as well as the people; and, consequently, that the judgments denounced were only conditional, in case the warning was neglected; for it is manifest that God mercifully tendered to them (even at the eve of their destruction) a continuance of the

*And what "wrong" or "violence to the stranger" can be more oppressive than that of detaining him in an involuntary servitude, without wages, in a miserable, wretched bondage, worse than that of brute beasts!

monarchy (viz. "kings sitting upon the throne of David") if they would but resolve to execute judgment and righteousness;" to "deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor;" and to do no wrong, no violence, "to the stranger," &c. But the prophet also added much more advice to the king and his court, though he was not "made of the king's council (See 2 Chron. xxv. 16 to 24.);" for he boldly warned the monarch by the tremendous examples of God's judgments upon three of his immediate predecessors in the kingdom; two of whom were his own brothers, the sons of king Josiah; and the third his own nephew, whom he immediately succeeded. They were all particularly mentioned by him in the proper order of their respective reigns, as we find by the copy of his message or remonstrance, preserved in the collections of his prophecies; and, throughout the said remonstrance, frequent allusions are made to the principal causes of the failure and destruction of each of them which afford a most striking and interesting lesson to kings and governors in general; but it must have been more particularly affecting to Zedekiah, if we consider his critical situation at the time the message was delivered to him, and that the examples of vengeance, to which the prophet referred him, were actually accomplished in the persons of his nearest relations and predecessors, who were successively deprived of their royal dignity, and carried away in chains into a slavish captivity; the very fate which, the prophet assured him, was to be his own!

But before I recite the remainder of God's message to the court of Zedekiah, it will be necessary for me to give some general account of that monarch and of his immediate predecessors, in order that the remonstrance, in which they are all distinctly mentioned, may be more easily understood by the generality of readers. It will likewise be necessary for me to prove, that the whole 22d chapter of Jeremiah is included in that message, or remonstrance, which the prophet was then to deliver in the presence of the whole court of Zedekiah. And I propose to insert also some remarks, as they occur, concerning the prophet himself, and

the order of time, in which he delivered the several tremendous predictions of God's vengeance against the wicked princes.

Zedekiah was the son of that excellent prince Josiah king of Judah, on whose account, expressly, the dreadful vengeance, due to that wicked nation, was postponed for several years, viz. till after his death.

The Scriptures mention four sons of king Josiah, viz. "the first born, Johanan (or John); the second, Jehoiakim; the third, Zedekiah; and the fourth, Shallum." 1 Chron. iii. 15. What became of the eldest son, Johanan, or John, is not recorded (1 Chron. iii. 15.) but all the others ascended the throne of David; and first of all, the youngest son Shallum, whom, on the death of king Josiah, "the people of the land took, and" (as it seems, without regard to seniority) "made him king in his father's stead in Jerusalem." 2 Chron. xxxvi. 1.

The reign of Shallum (alias Jehoahaz 2 Kings xxiii. 31, 32.) was only three months; for he regarded not the eternal laws of God, and thereby drew down the divine vengeance upon himself, by the hand of Pharaoh-Neco, who deposed him at Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxvi. 3,) and afterwards "put him in bands at Riblah in the land of Hamath, that he might not reign in Jerusalem" (2 Kings xxiii. 33) there being, probably, some reason to apprehend, that he would attempt to supplant his elder brother Eliakim, whom the Egyptian conqueror had thought proper to set up in his stead upon "the throne of David;" and therefore, to secure the new established monarch, he not only put Shallum in bands, but also carried him away with him into captivity in Egypt where he died (2 Kings xxiii. 34.)

Thus Eliakim (through the mercy of God to "the house of David") was raised to the throne and kingdom of his ancestors, even by a foreign enemy! who also changed his name (that the providence of God might be more apparent in the revolution) from Eliakim (אל־וקיים, signifying God will establish) to Jehoiakim, signifying (as I have before remarked) "Jehovah will establish;" whereby it is manifest that even a heathen monarch took pains to remind the

new king of Judah of his dependence on Jehovah the God of Israel, whose laws and religion of course, we may presume, were likewise re-established in Judea by the same foreign authority; for it would have been absurd in the Egyptian monarch to have changed the name of his royal vassal to another name more particularly testifying a belief in Jehovah, the true God of Israel, if he did not mean thereby to keep the Jewish king in constant remembrance of the national profession of law and religion by the sacred name of the great Author of them!

The same remarkable change in the name of a future king of Judah was made also by another foreign and heathen conqueror afterwards, in honor of the eternal Jehovah; so that it was manifestly the Providence of God which inclined these two great enemies of the Jewish State, though they were also mortal enemies to each other, (I mean Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar) to pursue exactly the same method in restoring "the sceptre of Judah" to "the house of David," and in declaring the establishment of the national law and religion, by putting a respectful memorial of the sacred name of Jehovah upon the new-raised monarchs!

In the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, though Judea and all Syria were then under the Egyptian empire, the prophet Jeremiah, in his 27th chapter foretold the universal empire of "Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon," even before that great warrior was king of Babylon, his father Nabopollasar, who was also called Nebuchodonosor, being still alive. The prophet was directed to make bonds and yokes, and put them upon his own neck, and to send them afterwards to the kings of several neighboring nations, with a most awful message from God concerning the rising power of the Babylonian monarch:—"And now" (said the prophet, in the name of the Lord, or Jehovah, of hosts, the God of Israel, see ver. 4.) "have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant;" &c.—"and all nations" (many of whom are expressly mentioned in the third verse) "shall serve HIM, and his SON, and his son's son, until the very time

of his land come" (for the empire continued for three lives or successions, until the Babylonian measure of iniquity and oppression was fulfilled in the reign of Belthazar, when the Medes and Persians were to retaliate upon them the hard slavery of Israel); "and then," continues the prophet, "many nations and great Kings shall serve themselves of HIM," &c. Jer. xxvii. 6, 7. that is, they shall enslave his people, in the same manner that he and his two successors enslaved and oppressed other nations: rendering slavery for slavery.

In the same chapter Zedekiah is also mentioned by name as king of Judah (Jer. xxvii. 1 to 3,) several years before he received the name of Zedekiah; so that neither he himself, whose proper name was Mattaniah, nor any other person could possibly know, in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, what particular person was then signified by the name of Zedekiah; for even Nebuchadnezzar himself, who afterwards gave him that name, was not king of Babylon when the prophecy was delivered, as I have already remarked. But after this foreign conqueror had really appointed a king of Judah, and given him the name of Zedekiah, the name foretold by the prophet, such an extraordinary circumstance would add unquestionable authority to the truth of Jeremiah's mission, and would render Zedekiah and his courtiers inexcusable, as they really were, for rejecting the earnest and repeated remonstrances of that prophet.

This timely prediction, therefore, in the reign of Jehoiakim, with the internal proofs which it contained, concerning the necessity of Zedekiah's submission to the Babylonian yoke, seems to have been absolutely necessary to enable the prophet to confute the many false prophets, diviners, dreamers, &c. (see 9th verse) who were, afterward, in Zedekiah's reign, publicly employed to excite the people to shake off the Babylonian yoke.

The prophet was also forewarned in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, as the same chapter testifies, that the Kings of Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Zidon would send messengers to a "Zedekiah king of Judah; all which kings,

as Grotius remarks, were subdued by Nebuchadnezzar; and therefore it is not improbable that the said messengers or ambassadors were sent to Zedekiah for the purpose of forming a league against the Babylonian power: the public declarations of the false prophets above mentioned, and the actual rebellion soon afterwards of Zedekiah himself, renders the said supposition about the business of the messengers very probable; so that, if this singular state of affairs be considered, the sending, at such a seasonable time, to the several neighboring kings, by the return of their ambassadors, the yokes which had been worn by Jeremiah, together with God's awful message, that he would punish that nation which will not serve Nebuchadnezzar, and put their neck under his yoke, (Jer. xxvii. 8,) must needs strike these heathen monarchs, if they were not entirely abandoned in their principles, with fear and reverence; especially as their ambassadors would hear at Jerusalem, that the divine message concerning the yokes, then sent, had been revealed to the prophet long before (thirteen or fourteen years) in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, in token of which the prophet had worn yokes upon his own neck (see chap. xxviii. ver. 10, 12, 13); and that no less than three circumstances of that extraordinary revelation were now already fulfilled: the prophet having not only foretold the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and the reign of Zedekiah, a name not applicable to Zedekiah himself till the Babylonian conqueror thought proper to give it him, so that no worldly prudence could foresee such an event, but had also foretold the very circumstance in which they themselves were concerned, viz. that messengers should be sent to this Zedekiah by such and such kings!

In what year these messengers or ambassadors really arrived at Jerusalem, or returned from thence, does not appear; but as the yokes were, first of all, to be put upon the prophet's own neck, before he was to send them to the kings (compare the 2d and 3d verses), and as it appears that he really wore such a wooden yoke, as a sign against them, in the temple, so late as the 4th year of Zedekiah, when a false prophet took it from his neck, and broke it,

and thereby occasioned a further command respecting those kings, viz. that the prophet should "make for them yokes of iron (Jer. xxviii. 13,)" it seems most probable that the wooden yokes first ordered had not then been sent to them; and, consequently, that the messengers of those kings had not as yet arrived at Jerusalem, for, undoubtedly, the prophet would obey the divine command as soon as he had the proper opportunity of doing so; and as Zedekiah went to Babylon in the same year (see Jer. li. 59,) it is likely the messengers did not arrive, nor he rebel, till the year following. Nevertheless, in that year (the fourth of Zedekiah) the prophet declared the message to Zedekiah himself, which he had before been charged to send to the other kings:—"I spake also" (says he in ch. xxvii. ver. 12,) "to Zedekiah king of Judah according to all these words" (that is, "according to all these words" which precede in the same chapter respecting the yokes, and which had been revealed in the reign of Jehoiakim) "saying, bring your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him, and his people, and live. Why will ye die, thou, and thy people, by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence, as the Lord hath spoken against the nation that will not serve the king of Babylon?" &c. See ver. 12 and 13. The Almighty had laid upon all the other nations of Palestine and Syria the same fatal necessity, either to submit to a foreign yoke, or die! So that we have here a very remarkable example of God's vengeance and retribution upon several wicked and corrupt nations which regarded not the eternal laws of God!—They must either serve the king of Babylon, or be destroyed;—there was no alternative!—*be destroyed* "by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence, as the Lord hath spoken" (compare the 13th verse with the 8th) "until I have consumed them by his hand," that is by the hand of the Babylonian conqueror, the appointed instrument of God's temporal vengeance:—and the God of armies (יהוה צבאות) hath in all ages raised up some powerful scourges of this kind to punish wicked and ungrateful nations with fire and sword, and

to reduce them to an unnatural bondage, on account of national iniquities! Even the present state of mankind affords some melancholy proofs of this. How many nations, now subsisting in the world, have forfeited their natural liberty, and are now sitting under the iron yokes of unnatural, arbitrary governments, subjected to the will and pleasure of their respective sovereigns, instead of law! And if the particular history of any, or perhaps all, of these nations be carefully examined, it will not, I believe, be found that any of them were ever reduced to such a deplorable state of national misery, till by national wickedness, and public contempt of God's eternal laws, they had rendered a national retribution strictly necessary, according to the unerring rules of eternal justice! All hopes, therefore of redress to these enslaved nations must be vain, without a sincere reformation of manners in each nation respectively, and without public and most earnest national or general endeavors to obtain reconciliation and forgiveness from the *the King of Kings*; as nothing but a strict obedience to his laws can render any nation truly free. Jeremiah made the same declaration also to the priests and people that he had made to the king: "Also I spake" (says he) "to the priests, and to all the people, saying, thus saith the Lord; hearken not to the words of your prophets that prophesy unto you, saying, behold, the vessels of the Lord's house shall now shortly be brought again from Babylon; for they prophesy a lie (Micah iii. 11. Nehem. vi. 10 to 12,) unto you. Hearken not unto them: serve the king of Babylon, and live. Wherefore should this city be laid waste?" Jer. xxvii. 16, 17.

The wicked prophets, who thus misled the people with lies, presumed nevertheless to use the sacred name of Jehovah (Jer. xxvii. 14, 15,) as if they had really declared the will of God; so that the true prophet had need, not only of all those unquestionable proofs of his divine mission, which I have already mentioned, but even, of other proofs also, to enable him to oppose the lying prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of Jehovah, as well as himself; for "In the same year" (that is, in the fourth of

Zedekiah) one of these wicked prophets, "Hananiah, the son of Azur the prophet, which was of Gibeon, (1 Chron. xxi. 29. 1 Kings iii. 5,)"—"took the yoke from off the prophet Jeremiah's neck, and brake it. And Hananiah spake" (in the temple) "in the presence of all the people, saying, thus saith the Lord; even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon from the neck of all nations within the space of two full years." Jer. xxviii. 1, 10, 11. Upon which, it seems, the prophet Jeremiah was directed by God to reprove Hananiah with a severe sentence; for he not only declared that "Yokes of Iron" should be substituted instead of the "yokes of wood" (Jer. xxviii. 12, 13,) which Hananiah had broken, as I before remarked, but he also pointed out the lying prophet himself to the public observation, as a notable and undeniable token, that the prophecies of Jeremiah were of divine authority!—"Hear now, Hananiah," (said the true prophet): "the Lord" (i. e. Jehovah) "hath not sent thee; but thou makest this people to trust in a lie. Therefore thus saith the Lord;—Behold, I will cast thee forth from the face of the earth: this year thou shalt die, because thou hast taught rebellion against the Lord. So Hananiah the prophet *died* the same year, in the seventh month." Jer. xxviii. 15—17. That is, he died exactly two months after the prediction, which was made in the fifth month of the fourth year of Zedekiah. Such evidence, added to the former clear tokens of authenticity which this prophecy of the yokes carried with it, must render Zedekiah and his courtiers totally inexcusable for neglecting the divine warning, and relying upon false prophets.

Thus the propriety of considering the former part of the 27th chapter as a revelation in the time of Jehoiakim, agreeable to the testimony of the Hebrew text, is rendered apparent by the particular advantages which such a prior revelation would afterwards give to the true prophet, when he had to oppose the pretended prophecies delivered in the fourth year of Zedekiah: and the remaining part of the 27th chapter, from the 12th verse, wherein the prophet mentions his personal address to Zedekiah, must necessarily

be attributed to a future time, which in the following chapter (the 28th) is expressly declared to have been in the fourth year of Zedekiah.

* * * * * *

Can any injury, except that of taking away a man's life, exceed that of taking away a man's liberty, who has never offended us! Can any robbery or injustice whatsoever be more atrocious than that of wearing out our poor brethren in a hard involuntary service, without wages or reward! thereby continually robbing them of the fruit of their labors! Have I not shown, by unquestionable examples from Scripture, that this is a crying sin, and that the Almighty hath denounced wo (Jer. xvii. 13,) against all such offenders? Do we not profess to serve the same God who so severely punished the Jews for this very crime? And is there any just ground to hope, that God, who spared not his own peculiar people, will, nevertheless, excuse the inhabitants of Great Britain and her colonies, when they are wilfully guilty of the same offence!

The whole tenor of the Scriptures teaches us, that slavery was ever detestable in the sight of God, insomuch that it has generally been denounced (and, of course, inflicted) as the punishment of the most abandoned sinners; of which I have already given a great variety of instances.

And have not we just reason to dread the severe vengeance of Almighty God, when it is notorious, that the tyranny exercised in the British colonies is infinitely more unmerciful than than that which was formerly exercised by the Chaldeans, insomuch that the state of the Jews in their captivity might be esteemed rather as freedom than bondage, when compared with the deplorable servitude of the wretched negro slaves, as well as of the white servants, in our Colonies?

What must be the consequence of such abominable wickedness?

By as much as we exceed the Assyrians and Babylonians in religious knowledge, by so much more severely may we expect the hand of God upon us for our monstrous abuse of such advantages!

The inhabitants of Great Britain and the inhabitants of the colonies seem to be almost equally guilty of oppression.

The colonies protest against the iniquity of the slave-trade; but, nevertheless, continue to hold the poor wretched slaves in a most detestable bondage! Great Britain, indeed, keeps no slaves, but publicly encourages the slave trade, and contemptuously neglects or rejects every petition or attempt of the colonists against that notorious wickedness!

DATE DUE

MAR 03 2003

FEB 05 2003

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
0038555328

92Sh20
S

01350412
92S.H20
S